

GOVERNMENT OF  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

\* \* \* \* \*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD

\* \* \* \* \*

OVERFLOW MEETING

\* \* \* \* \*

Thursday August 4, 2011  
9:00a.m. - 1:27p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

Board of Zoning Hearing  
441 4<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Room 220 South  
Washington, D.C.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Catherine Buell

Maria Casarella

Robert Sonderman

Elinor Bacon

Pamela Scott

Steve Walcott

Joseph Taylor

## C o n t e n t s

1.	Capitol Hill Historic District 7 <sup>th</sup> and Pennsylvania Avenue, SE HPA #11-195. . . .3
2.	Mount Pleasant Historic District 3146 16 <sup>th</sup> Street, NW, HPA #11-345. . . . .183
3.	14 <sup>th</sup> Street Historic District 1427-29 Rhode Island Ave, NW HPA #11-357. . .216
	Conclusion of Meeting . . . . .230

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRPERSON BUELL: This is a  
3 continuation of our July 28, 2011, Historic  
4 Preservation Review Board Hearing, and we have an  
5 overflow session.

6 Today is August 4, 2011, and our first  
7 case is Hine Junior High School redevelopment.

8 We're going to start off with the, I  
9 guess, the Staff, and if the Applicant can come  
10 forward. It looks like a couple of people are  
11 probably still going to come and testify, but  
12 we're going to get started.

13 We have Joseph Taylor, who, if it's okay  
14 with the Applicant, is going to show up a few  
15 minutes late. He informed us before the hearing  
16 that he would be here about 9:30, so he may miss  
17 part of the presentation, but I know that he  
18 wants to also provide his comments.

19 So let's get started, we'll start with  
20 Steve.

21 MR. WALCOTT: Okay. As you say, this is  
22 another review of the Hine Project. This is the

1 follow up to last month's meeting in which you  
2 reviewed the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Building, the Pennsylvania  
3 Avenue Buildings, and the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Building.

4 Today we're going to focus on the North  
5 Residential Building, which is on the north side  
6 of the C Street Plaza, what we're calling the  
7 South Residential Building on the south side of  
8 the C Street Plaza, and both the Plaza design  
9 itself, as well as the overall landscape plan.

10 Since this was first presented, this  
11 aspect, these components were presented for the  
12 first time in April; Oehme van Sweden has been  
13 brought on as the landscape Architect for the  
14 project and has helped develop that to a much  
15 greater degree than when you last saw it.

16 I think I'm going to let Amy go ahead and  
17 walk through, are we having problems with...?

18 MS. WEINSTEIN: Well, while we're  
19 waiting, it's a pleasure to be back, thank you so  
20 much for having the continuation meeting.

21 I'm accompanied today by Lisa Delplace  
22 who is a principal in Oehme van Sweden Landscape

1 Architects, she is the Landscape Architect for  
2 this project.

3           We thought the order of presentation  
4 today would start with Lisa talking about all the  
5 public space, to include the Plaza design, and  
6 then I will discuss the two buildings that we're  
7 bringing forward to you today. So now all we  
8 need are the slides.

9           MS. DELPLACE: Great. As Amy said, I'm  
10 Lisa Delplace, I'm a principal with Oehme van  
11 Sweden and Associates.

12           So, what I'd like to do is walk you  
13 through the public space, and basically we'll  
14 walk completely around the project.

15           I'll begin with C Street. We're getting  
16 some assistance that should be out shortly, so we  
17 can give a few minutes to make sure that the  
18 screens work properly.

19           MS. BUELL: Amy we'll give them about two  
20 more minutes. Is there any part of the  
21 presentation we can start with, without the  
22 projector?

1 MS. WEINSTEIN: Do you all have your  
2 booklets with you? Would you like to start by  
3 directing them through the drawings in the  
4 booklets?

5 MS. BUELL: Is there an extra copy of the  
6 booklet for us to refer to?

7 MS. DELPLACE: If you'd like I can do it  
8 from the drawings, just walk through the drawings  
9 while we work on our technical problems.

10 MS. BUELL: Because this is an overflow  
11 day we don't quite have all of our systems up and  
12 running, so...

13 MS. DELPLACE: Okay, so what we'd like to  
14 do, since we're having technical problems with  
15 the computer is; I'll walk you through the  
16 drawings that were submitted July 18<sup>th</sup>, I believe  
17 you all have a copy of that.

18 I'd like to begin with the site plan and  
19 just get everyone oriented.

20 So we have C Street, which is on the left  
21 side of the drawing, A Street at the top of the  
22 drawing, Pennsylvania Avenue to the right, and

1 then 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

2 To begin with I'd like to talk a little  
3 bit about C Street and the development of the  
4 Plaza, and the streetscape along C Street.

5 So, as you can see we've brought the  
6 brick, the Historic Capitol Hill Brick, down both  
7 sides of C Street. What we've done is we've  
8 looked at this very carefully in terms of how to  
9 respect, kind of, the Historic C Street as it  
10 would have come through, but also allow it to be  
11 a functional plaza on the weekends.

12 So, what we're proposing is to have a  
13 flush curb so that it allows for weekend  
14 activities, such as the markets, to happen. Then  
15 you can see the street tree spacing, and between  
16 the street trees we have bollards that will  
17 delineate the road bed from the sidewalk.

18 To the right we have the plaza which is  
19 currently delineated with the lighter gray color.  
20 We're exploring materials at this point, picking  
21 up on the materials that will be used in the  
22 architecture as well as fountains that thread

1 through the space.

2           So the first one, which is really at the  
3 corner of C Street, and 7<sup>th</sup> Street, is the largest  
4 of the two, but then there will be two others  
5 threading through the Plaza area.

6           The next drawing which is on the same  
7 page, so the drawing on the right hand side shows  
8 the weekend condition. The configuration of the  
9 road bed with the flush curbs allows us to get 68  
10 market tents on the weekend, that can be accessed  
11 by both the sidewalk to the north, as well as a  
12 12 foot travel lane here so that the back of the  
13 tents are stacked on both sides, and accessed  
14 from all four sides.

15           Here is the potential for a sidewalk café  
16 or a restaurant; these were the fountains that I  
17 was just describing.

18           So moving on, I wanted to illustrate a  
19 section cut through this part of the Plaza. So  
20 as you can see starting from here to the north we  
21 have the sidewalk which would be, again, the  
22 traditional Capitol Hill brick sidewalk. You can



1 see the proposed street trees and those bollards  
2 that I was describing are actually in line with  
3 the trunks of the trees.

4 In studying this, this allowed us to be  
5 able to have clear access to the tents. The  
6 beauty of having the flush curb, as well as the  
7 bollards, is that it allows the entire space to  
8 be used for special events, and programming.

9 So this is the configuration of the new C  
10 Street. As it goes through the space, you can see  
11 the tents, then they required kind of a 12 foot  
12 emergency drive, and then again 2 more tents, the  
13 Plaza, and then the potential for a restaurant,  
14 or café space.

15 When we began to think about bollards,  
16 and obviously in Washington, D.C., bollards can  
17 often have a negative connotation, so we really  
18 looked to the historic fabric of Capitol Hill,  
19 and the Historic Park Fencing that you see on  
20 many of the reservations including the one at  
21 Virginia Avenue. We think this can be adapted and  
22 really used in this space as a bollard that would

1 be traditionally seen on a reservation in  
2 Washington.

3           On the left is the idea for the fountain,  
4 understanding that we have several months that  
5 are quite cold, and fountains are often turned  
6 off. This fountain will be slightly raised 18  
7 inches above grade, but a very shallow pool with  
8 jets that can be manipulated to be turned on or  
9 off, depending on the season, or the event that's  
10 being held.

11           Moving along 7<sup>th</sup> Street, we've brought in  
12 traditional tree spacing that you would find on  
13 Capitol Hill which is about 35 feet on center.

14           What we're looking at though is  
15 exploring a continuous tree trench along 7<sup>th</sup>  
16 Street, and along 8<sup>th</sup> Street that will actually  
17 increase the viability of trees over time.

18           So we have a 10 foot clear pedestrian  
19 walk zone along 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and we're still able  
20 to have café seating and retail along 7<sup>th</sup> Street,  
21 as well. Then, the section that cuts through  
22 there, so you can see we have about 8 feet, which

1 allows flexibility for the retail space to have  
2 cafes, the 10 foot clear zone, and then the 6  
3 foot tree spacing.

4           What we're considering here is that, even  
5 though we're having only 6 by 6 tree spacing with  
6 planting in those zones, that the entire length  
7 of 7<sup>th</sup> Street would actually be a continuous tree  
8 trench.

9           If we move along 8<sup>th</sup> Street there will be  
10 3 sections cut along 8<sup>th</sup> Street, because we have  
11 grade, as we move towards Pennsylvania Avenue.  
12 In looking at 8<sup>th</sup> Street we wanted to look at the  
13 existing conditions and the historic character of  
14 this particular area of 8<sup>th</sup> Street, from  
15 Pennsylvania Avenue to North Carolina, which is  
16 residential.

17           So, in those residential zones you see a  
18 tree pit that is along 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and then you  
19 see a planted area in front of the homes, and  
20 then the gates and walkways going up to the  
21 doors.

22           So, below you can see in this particular

1 area, because of the grade that it's pretty much  
2 a flush condition as you come into the planted  
3 yard here, and we propose using the traditional  
4 Hairpin fence that's found on Capitol Hill.

5 In the next section, which is basically  
6 mid-block, the condition changes slightly, it's  
7 still directly in with only a few steps down.  
8 Then, by the time we reach towards Pennsylvania  
9 Avenue the condition changes again. So we've  
10 maintained the flush condition coming in off of  
11 the street with two steps up to the door.

12 Just to give you an idea of the  
13 character, we're really looking at that same  
14 traditional character that you see all over  
15 Capitol Hill, which is here, you see the Hairpin  
16 fence, the traditional 6 by 6 street tree boxes,  
17 brick paving, and then the fence here. This  
18 happens to be Ellen Wilson, which is located at  
19 7<sup>th</sup> and G Streets.

20 Now I'd like to turn it over to Amy.

21 MS. WEINSTEIN: Okay, thank you. So Lisa  
22 just talked about all the streetscape, the public

1 space in the project. I'm going to now talk  
2 about the North Residential Building, and the  
3 Plaza Building. Last month we were here we  
4 talked about the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Residential, and the  
5 office building.

6 Below grade under the North Residential  
7 Building there is a basement level, and south of  
8 the Historic C Street right of way, is a below  
9 grade garage that is under all three buildings  
10 south of C Street.

11 So I'll start with the North Residential  
12 Building. Located in this area of the site, the  
13 site for this is bounded by 8<sup>th</sup> Street to the  
14 east, 7<sup>th</sup> Street to the west, the C Street on the  
15 south, and then a public alley that is 20 feet  
16 wide all along the rear lot line. There's also a  
17 10 foot wide alley that runs north-south that  
18 hits about the centerline of that 20 foot wide  
19 alley.

20 The floor plans have not changed  
21 substantially, I think, since we were here in  
22 April talking about this building. The below

1 grade level has retail that's accessed with its  
2 own store front, at grade. Then they are  
3 building support areas in that level.

4 At grade there's retail all along C  
5 Street, and wrapping around onto 7<sup>th</sup> Street. The  
6 main entrance to the lobby for the apartment  
7 building is located on C Street here, as well as  
8 two individual dwelling units, each with their  
9 own front door entry directly from the public  
10 sidewalk on 8<sup>th</sup> Street, as well as rear entries  
11 from the lobby.

12 The two floors above that, are a double  
13 loaded corridor with apartments on either side.  
14 Then there's a partial fourth floor which is set  
15 back about 30 feet from the 7<sup>th</sup> Street wall, and  
16 about 48 feet from here to here, from 8<sup>th</sup> Street,  
17 and then it's 68 feet from there to that part of  
18 the 4 story mass.

19 The roof plan, there's no enclosed  
20 mechanical penthouse on this building, instead  
21 there is a six foot tall screen wall around all  
22 of the equipment that will be there. That screen

1 wall is set back five feet from the alley line.  
2 This is a section through the four story part of  
3 the building, and on the left is April and August  
4 proposals.

5 We basically dropped the second floor  
6 slab two feet down, which had the result of  
7 dropping the top of the building an additional  
8 two feet down from where it was in April.

9 The blue lines on these drawings, I know  
10 you all have no interest in zoning heights  
11 necessarily because this is not a zoning forum,  
12 however, the community has asked us to add these  
13 height limits to the diagrams, and this would be  
14 the C2A 50 foot height limit which the 4 story  
15 part of the building is below. C2A is the zoning  
16 all up and down 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

17 This is a section through the three story  
18 part of the building that is closest to 8<sup>th</sup>  
19 Street. Again, the second floor slab did drop  
20 two feet. But, because we realized that we need  
21 to extend the parapets up 18 inches to height  
22 some rooftop fans, the parapet itself has only

1 dropped 6 inches since April.

2           These are the famous Sonderman site line  
3 drawings. On the upper left you have a little  
4 fellow over here who is standing at this red dot,  
5 standing on actually the raised front yard with  
6 his back to the existing house across the street.  
7 As you can see the fourth floor, as well as the  
8 mechanical screen, the view of that is cut off by  
9 the top of the main building.

10           Over on 7<sup>th</sup> Street where this red dot  
11 represents this fellow standing under the solid  
12 roof of the market canopy, he would not be seeing  
13 the fourth floor or the penthouse. If he were to  
14 walk over all the way against Eastern Market; the  
15 solid roof of the canopy itself would obstruct  
16 that view.

17           On the lower left are 2 people, one is  
18 standing at the edge of the 20 foot alley, that  
19 runs from 8<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and the view of that  
20 mechanical screen would not be seen.

21           Then this fellow has walked back up the  
22 10 foot wide alley, and right about there he also



1 does not see it, however, if he were to turn and  
2 walk further down that alley and turnaround he  
3 would start to see a part of that mechanical  
4 screen.

5           This is the revised C Street façade, here  
6 it is at the top, in context with the Eastern  
7 Market on the left, the three stories becoming  
8 four stories, and then stepping back to a three  
9 story mass of the North Residential Building.  
10 This is 8<sup>th</sup> Street and the existing houses across  
11 the street on 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

12           At the top of this slide is the April  
13 façade, there was much discussion, and  
14 encouragement to move away from this kind of  
15 horizontal frame expression, and an expression of  
16 this as kind of a single unit, and bring it back  
17 more into a feeling of the scale and proportion  
18 of buildings on 7<sup>th</sup> Street in the commercial area.

19           So the redesigned façade is below, and  
20 the four story mass has been designed as 5  
21 vertically proportioned units, with a shadow  
22 reveal separating them. They have a continuous

1 brick base on the ground floor which is the same  
2 brick that would be used on the three story  
3 pieces to either side.

4           In the center of each unit is a retail  
5 shop window opening, and within that opening  
6 there will be various configurations of store  
7 fronts so that we get the variety of color, and  
8 shape, and shadow, in and out of doors as this is  
9 developed, and actual retailers are known. That  
10 would all happen within that framework of that  
11 opening.

12           Above the ground floor are two floors  
13 clad in Terra Cotta Tile to break up the mass.

14           The panels below the windows would be  
15 some type of solid material, currently we're  
16 thinking about a very tight little corrugated  
17 copper sheet, or something that would add  
18 additional richness, and materials to the  
19 building.

20           The fourth floor is clad in the gray  
21 roofing slate, and is treated as an attic story.

22           On the three story portions of the

1 building we've added a cornice since April. In  
2 addition to that, we have brought the slate down  
3 on the vertical wall, down to the top of the  
4 third floor window so we now have a good cornice  
5 working, and a bit of an attic expression to the  
6 top of the three story pieces.

7           This is the entrance to the apartment  
8 house over here, and we concur with both the  
9 Staff report, and the Restoration Society's  
10 comments; that this area does need a lot of  
11 further study, and development.

12           This then is the east elevation of the  
13 building facing 8<sup>th</sup> Street; here it is in context  
14 with the 20 foot wide alley next to it, and then  
15 the existing houses to the north, C Street over  
16 here, and then the four story mass of the 8<sup>th</sup>  
17 Street apartment house that we talked about last  
18 month.

19           Yesterday we received the Restoration  
20 Society's comments, and one of their comments was  
21 that this is being cast as two kinds of  
22 townhouses, two houses. When two houses were

1 built at once on The Hill, they often times would  
2 be mirrored, exactly the same but mirrored to  
3 each. Down at the ground floor at the time we  
4 thought that we couldn't do that, but spurred on  
5 by the Restoration Society's comments we went  
6 into the units and figured out a way that we  
7 could now use the same store front on both, and  
8 mirror them against each other.

9           The reason there is a blank area here is  
10 that there is a bathroom, and part of a kitchen  
11 that cannot accommodate windows, and that's a  
12 function of how narrow the whole building is,  
13 that the bathroom and kitchens in some cases are  
14 actually on the exterior wall, though I believe  
15 this window is next to the tub in the bathroom.

16           Then on the right is the 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
17 façade, the three story portion in the center in  
18 the main mass of the building is the entry to the  
19 ground floor retail.

20           This is a show window on either side that  
21 project 1 foot 4 inches out from the main  
22 building, and in that one would be the doors that

1 would lead you into the lobby that would take you  
2 downstairs to the lower level retail here.

3           The alley elevation is to the left, this  
4 is actually the high point of the grade on the  
5 entire site right here. We've wrapped the  
6 architecture of the three story pieces back to  
7 the beginning of the four story piece, though the  
8 slate and cornice of the four story piece that  
9 continues all the way around, then the same brick  
10 that is used elsewhere is used on the rest of the  
11 façade.

12           So this was a rough sketch-up view in  
13 April, standing on C Street in front of the  
14 Eastern Market, looking at the North Residential  
15 Building. I believe there were Board comments  
16 about looking more carefully at the scale of  
17 openings, and other architectural elements  
18 relative to the scale of the buildings on 7<sup>th</sup>  
19 Street.

20           So this is the revised view from about  
21 the same position on C Street with the scale and  
22 proportion of openings modified accordingly, as

1 well as the addition of the cornice on the three  
2 story portion.

3           This was the view standing on C Street,  
4 looking west, so you're looking across 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
5 and down the new reopened C Street that was the  
6 North Residential Building back in April. This  
7 is the view today taken from a slightly different  
8 vantage point, so the perspective has shifted  
9 slightly, but you can see the addition of the  
10 cornice. The slate coming down to the top of the  
11 third floor windows, and I think a vast  
12 improvement on the proportioning and size of the  
13 windows. This would be a canopy over the lobby  
14 entrance to the building on C Street.

15           Then, this view in April was standing on  
16 8<sup>th</sup> Street looking south towards Pennsylvania  
17 Avenue. On the right here is the 20 foot wide  
18 alley that separates an existing house from the  
19 North Residential. This was the North  
20 Residential Building in April, and this is the  
21 North Residential Building in today's design with  
22 the opening scaled more appropriately to the size

1 of townhouse windows, and the second floor being  
2 dropped 2 feet has helped with the scale of the  
3 ground floor openings.

4           This is a view on 8<sup>th</sup> Street looking a  
5 little bit down into that alley, the 20 foot wide  
6 alley, to show how the architecture wraps around  
7 onto the alley.

8           These are the two individual doors into  
9 the two individual units that are located here.  
10 Then on the right, turning and stepping a few  
11 feet further south to just show how the existing  
12 house turns the alley.

13           Then back over on 7<sup>th</sup> Street the same  
14 kind of - - how the building turns onto the alley  
15 images. On the right is the 7<sup>th</sup> Street retail  
16 frontage here, that then turns and continues  
17 down to the end of the three story part, and on  
18 the left is how the existing historic structure  
19 currently turns the corner down the alley.

20           Then finally, for the North Residential  
21 Building, is this perspective rendering standing  
22 on 7<sup>th</sup> Street looking northwest across the Plaza,

1 and C Street to the North Residential Building.

2 Here you have the three story part of  
3 the building, the four story part, and the four  
4 story part ends exactly in line with the face of  
5 this part of the building, then the three story  
6 part of the building that fronts onto 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

7 Then finally I'll move onto what we call  
8 the Plaza Building. I think in April we called  
9 it the 7<sup>th</sup> Street Residential Building, it was  
10 just too difficult a term so we're just calling  
11 it the Plaza Building now, which you see here on  
12 the left.

13 So the Plaza Building in the site starts  
14 at the garage entry ramp which is over here. Now  
15 last month when we presented the A Street  
16 Residential Building we included the façade of  
17 this much of the Plaza Building with it, because  
18 we felt that, that architecture needed to wrap  
19 around and end here, and then the new  
20 architecture of the Plaza Building start fresh at  
21 the edge of the Plaza Building.

22 Internally the Plaza Building includes



1 the ramp and the area over it. So it starts  
2 where the Office building ends, comes up 7<sup>th</sup>  
3 Street, and then wraps onto C Street and the  
4 Plaza.

5 Last month, with the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Building  
6 and the Office Building we were looking at High  
7 Victorian Architecture as a kind of inspiration  
8 and source, for the character of those buildings.

9 This month, and because we realized  
10 what we're doing with the Hine Project is doing  
11 contemporary interpretations of these historical  
12 buildings that if we did all interpretations of  
13 High Victorian Architecture we wouldn't have the  
14 type of variety that, in fact we see on Capitol  
15 Hill.

16 So, for the Plaza Building we've been  
17 looking at late Victorian Architecture. A great  
18 example on The Hill would be Hornblower and  
19 Marshall's design for the U.S. Marine Barracks on  
20 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which you see here, the individual  
21 officers housing, I believe on 8<sup>th</sup> Street and then  
22 a long building fronting onto 9<sup>th</sup> Street.

1           Here you see a much more restrained,  
2   simplified, type of architecture than the High  
3   Victorian Architecture. Often this was done as a  
4   reaction to the flamboyant, if I can use the  
5   Staff's term, rigid excess of the High Victorian  
6   Architecture.

7           So you see the introduction of classical  
8   elements, for example, these arches, but they're  
9   very delicately introduced, the actual window is  
10   not arched, they're very simple cornices. A lot  
11   of attention is paid to the actual masonry  
12   material. In this case there are two different  
13   types of Iron Spot Brick.

14           Also designed by Hornblower and Marshall,  
15   on the left, is a residence for Alexander Graham  
16   Bell, that was on Connecticut Avenue next to  
17   where the Candy Hardware Building is now. Here  
18   you see again a very restrained architecture, one  
19   arch here, very simple cornice, a very wide  
20   radius bow to the bay projection. In the  
21   beginning of thinking about the wall as a series  
22   of piers that are holding up a horizontal type

1 architectural elements.

2           On the right is Hornblower's own house on  
3 Hillyer Place which is rather astoundingly severe  
4 for the time, 1897. I included a photograph of  
5 this because I think the coloration of it is  
6 really wonderful.

7           This is a north facing façade, the base  
8 is a dark Iron Spot Brick, the middle part is a  
9 lighter, then there's a lighter part, and then a  
10 very light top. So even though this is north  
11 facing the sun never really hits it. When you  
12 stand on Hillyer Place you have the sense that  
13 the sun is hitting the top of this building and  
14 filtering down.

15           So back to the Plaza Building itself, the  
16 ground floor plan starts at the end of the Office  
17 Building, has ground floor retail along 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
18 wrapping onto the Plaza. Then the main entry, and  
19 lobby for the apartment house is located in this  
20 location, with the main entry right here.

21           The three floors above that are double  
22 loaded corridor, the fifth floor sets back, we

1 lose these units here, so that the five story  
2 mass stops here.

3           Then the roof has the mechanical  
4 penthouse, and equipment, and one amenity space  
5 over here. That built area is setback about 30  
6 feet from the C Street wall, and a little more  
7 than 28 feet from the 7<sup>th</sup> Street wall.

8           The elevation of the building on 7<sup>th</sup>  
9 Street at the top you see it in the context with  
10 existing buildings on 7<sup>th</sup> Street, to the north the  
11 20 foot alley, the North Residential Building,  
12 and then the Plaza Building, which is next to a 4  
13 story piece of the Office Building, and the  
14 Office Building then steps up towards  
15 Pennsylvania Avenue.

16           At a larger scale below that is the 7<sup>th</sup>  
17 Street elevation. As you can see we've added a  
18 cornice to this building, we have a base, a  
19 middle, and a top in terms of that coloration  
20 getting lighter as it moves up. We have five bay  
21 projections into the public space, they project  
22 four feet, as do most bay projections on The

1 Hill, and they are 12 feet wide.

2           Around the corner onto C Street and the  
3 Plaza, here we have 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and this is 8<sup>th</sup>  
4 Street over here. This is the part of the  
5 building that was reviewed last month, and we  
6 looked at this façade here, which is as kind of  
7 the end bookend to the terrace of 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
8 Housing, with the two garage doors in it.

9           So internally these units are actually  
10 part of this building, but the architecture of  
11 the Plaza Building from the outside visually  
12 starts in that corner. That wall has a  
13 projection that you see here that projects 2 feet  
14 8 inches out from the main wall, in April it  
15 projected 7 feet out, so we've reduced it, and  
16 we've also brought it in from the corners of the  
17 building so that the main mass of the building is  
18 clearly seen, and it's seen as an attachment, or  
19 a projection from that main mass.

20           Then the entrance to the apartment house  
21 is located over here, we currently have 2  
22 stories, 2 foot 8 out projection with a canopy

1 that definitely needs to be restudied, per the  
2 Staff comments, located over here.

3           Again, we've introduced a few classical  
4 elements, these arches here, arch there; there  
5 are arches on the 7<sup>th</sup> Street bays as well as this  
6 very simple cornice.

7           I'd like to talk about the architecture  
8 of the projections on the Plaza Building for a  
9 minute, and talk about Trabeation, Trabeated  
10 Architecture which is architecture about post and  
11 lintel, or column and beam.

12           Starting with Adolph Cluss, who was the  
13 great Victorian Architect that designed the  
14 original school on the Hine site, and his  
15 Portland apartments on Thomas Circle, sadly  
16 demolished now, we see him playing around with a  
17 Trabeated Architecture. Up here there are a  
18 series of piers and vertical openings that create  
19 a very lively rhythm in this area, and those  
20 verticals are all supporting this horizontal  
21 beam-like element.

22           A contemporary of Adolph Cluss was

1 Alexander the Greek Thompson in Glasgow in  
2 Scotland. You see on the left a Terrace Housing  
3 project of his. He was an Architect who was  
4 somewhat, I think obsessed, with Trabeated  
5 Architecture. But here you see a terrace that  
6 where the entire façade is nothing but piers and  
7 horizontals, there are also projections from that  
8 façade, again made up out of vertical masonry  
9 piers, and horizontal entablatures above, with a  
10 change from floor to floor of the width of  
11 openings and piers.

12           On The Hill, we see on Barracks Row, on  
13 the right, the Citibank Building by Harding and  
14 Upman Architects in 1908, which actually  
15 coincidentally is owned and wonderfully  
16 maintained by our landscape architecture firm,  
17 Oehme van Sweden; they have their offices in it.  
18 Here you see the brick vertical piers supporting  
19 the horizontal entablature above.

20           Also on The Hill, somewhat later, 1928  
21 Paul Cray has designed the Shakespeare Library,  
22 Folger Shakespeare Library where he has used,

1 what I would call, Protomodern Piers supporting a  
2 large horizontal band at the top.

3           So to get back to the Plaza Building  
4 design itself, and the architecture of these  
5 projections, we have conceived of this as both a  
6 Trabeated system but have cast it in a  
7 contemporary light, in that it has a more lively  
8 rhythm than one perhaps would have seen in a  
9 straight Victorian version of it. That's because  
10 we think it's important to create a lively  
11 backdrop for all the activities that will be  
12 happening on the Plaza. It also allows the  
13 building to feel a little more contemporary than  
14 it otherwise would.

15           There are a few balcony projections that  
16 project out about 2 ½ feet from the projection  
17 also.

18           The arches up at the top, I've included a  
19 photograph of the art museum in Basel,  
20 Switzerland, where there's this one arched window  
21 in this big façade, to talk about how the arches  
22 are, what I call incised into the masonry wall,



1 and that is the type of articulation that we  
2 would be looking at, where we've shown them on  
3 these facades.

4           Also, in terms of the large projection  
5 there is also an order to it, it's not maybe  
6 immediately perceivable, but if you look at this  
7 element here, which is an element that's  
8 vertically proportioned, and the way to find it  
9 elsewhere is to look for the stacked balconies,  
10 1, 2, and then a 3<sup>rd</sup> off to the side. That  
11 element is repeated 4 times, it's repeated here,  
12 here, and here, and then between them is a hyphen  
13 piece that spans between them that is then  
14 repeated over here. So there is some order to  
15 the disorder.

16           Back to the Sonderman site lines, as we  
17 now call them in our office.

18           On 7<sup>th</sup> Street standing here with your  
19 back against the historic buildings, on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
20 here looking up, so you do not see the mechanical  
21 penthouse that was setback a little more than 28  
22 feet from here. Then the upper right diagram

1 shows the fellow standing with his back against  
2 the North Residential Building looking across C  
3 Street, and The Plaza, and also does not see the  
4 penthouse from there.

5           These then are the sketch up views, this  
6 is standing on 7<sup>th</sup> Street looking south to  
7 Pennsylvania Avenue. Here we have the 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
8 façade with the 5 bay projections on the front;  
9 these bays have a similar Trabeated Architecture  
10 as the projection on C Street. Again, we can see  
11 the cornice, the few classical elements, banding  
12 as regulating lines, very classical idea, and  
13 ultimately as we get the actual masonry materials  
14 down a gradation of a darker to a lighter as it  
15 moves up.

16           This is a view on 7<sup>th</sup> Street again,  
17 further south looking north, this would be the  
18 Office Building, the four story piece of it, and  
19 then we have the five story Plaza Building next  
20 to it. So here we see again, the five bay  
21 projections into the public space.

22           This is then the North Residential

1 Building, existing buildings further up 7<sup>th</sup>  
2 Street, and that's the top of the Eastern Market  
3 back there.

4           We were kind of curious to see how our  
5 Plaza Building related to the historic mass of  
6 the original Hine School that occupied this area  
7 of the site which you see here in this photograph  
8 taken in the 1960s.

9           What we've done is taken the footprint of  
10 the Plaza Building and overlay here with the  
11 footprint of the original Hine School, which  
12 we've gotten off of different based atlases,  
13 which they all concur with each other; we think  
14 this is a good guess about what its footprint  
15 was. As you can see, because we've splayed the  
16 Plaza Building back, the corner of the Plaza  
17 Building is hitting right about here relative to  
18 that corner of the building. So this isn't  
19 exactly exact, but we think it's pretty close.

20           The blue line then, would be the  
21 massing of the five story part of the Plaza  
22 Building on 7<sup>th</sup> Street as it relates to the

1 original massing of the Hine Junior High School.  
2 The main plain of the Plaza Building is actually  
3 in the same plain as this portion on the property  
4 line, here.

5 MS. CASARELLA: I have a quick question  
6 about that image.

7 MS. WEINSTEIN: Sure.

8 MS. CASARELLA: So the top of the  
9 rectangle, the blue line is at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor of  
10 the...

11 MS. WEINSTEIN: Yeah, that would be the  
12 top of the cornice.

13 MS. CASARELLA: The top of the cornice?

14 MS. WEINSTEIN: Yeah.

15 MS. CASARELLA: Okay, thank you.

16 MS. WEINSTEIN: Sure. This then is a  
17 view standing with your back to Eastern Market  
18 looking south down 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and also east down  
19 C Street, and across The Plaza at the revised  
20 design of the Plaza building.

21 This is what you saw in April which I've  
22 put in to point out that the projection at that

1 time. In addition to being 7 feet out from the  
2 main building; it also went all the way up to the  
3 top. Here again is the revised design where it's  
4 now only 2 foot 8 out from the building. It's  
5 now also fully glazed, before it was a lot of  
6 open air balconies, and the fact that it's been  
7 brought down a story and in further I think has  
8 been a big improvement.

9           Then again, the three story bays have  
10 been added, which helped to scale the building  
11 down towards the smallest buildings for blocks  
12 around, they practically are the buildings  
13 directly across the street on 7<sup>th</sup> Street.

14           Then finally, this architectural  
15 rendering of standing on the new C Street,  
16 looking west down C Street, that would be the  
17 Plaza there. To the right is the North  
18 Residential Building, and to the left is The  
19 Plaza Building, and on the far left would be the  
20 entry to the garage.

21           I believe that concludes our  
22 presentation.

1 MS. BUELL: Thank you. Okay so what  
2 we're going to do is we're going to open it up  
3 for Board comment, before we hear from the ANC,  
4 and if Steve or Amanda have anything to add.

5 Is the ANC here? Please come forward.  
6 So we'll have some questions from the Board, and  
7 then we'll have the ANC give his remarks after  
8 Steve or Amanda add their remarks. Maria do you  
9 want to start us off?

10 MS. CASARELLA: Sure. I want to begin  
11 with questions about the Plaza, the design of the  
12 Plaza.

13 The layout, the concept has always had  
14 this splayed opening on C Street, I just want you  
15 to discuss what determined the size of that, and  
16 how that relates to how many tents you have in  
17 the Market, and other factors about the size of  
18 that space.

19 MS. WEINSTEIN: We have up here the site  
20 plan if we could ignore the red circle around the  
21 North Residential.

22 The size of the Plaza, the question is

1 what determined the size of the Plaza?

2 Well it starts off with a historic 80  
3 foot right of way for C Street which would be  
4 along this line, and along this line. The  
5 further setback is represented by this kind of  
6 wedge shape here. What has set that actual line,  
7 why isn't it further back, for example? It  
8 begins to affect the functionality of this  
9 building, and we're trying to keep a certain  
10 amount of openness into this courtyard, because  
11 there are dwelling units that look into the  
12 courtyard as there are only windows, and this  
13 seem to be the place. That line moved a little  
14 bit back and forth and then it finally landed  
15 here.

16 Now because the garage entrance is here  
17 off of C Street, we can't close C Street to get  
18 tents on it during the weekend, because people  
19 need to come and go, in fact the vendors from the  
20 flea market themselves will be parking in the  
21 garage on the weekends, so we're not showing any  
22 tents in this area of C Street.

1           So then the remaining area for tents is  
2 this area, and they've been laid out with this 12  
3 foot wide aisle for an emergency vehicle to get  
4 through, should it be necessary. They've also  
5 been kept far enough away from the actual windows  
6 of the brick and mortar stores that will be  
7 located there so that those stores can also  
8 function during the weekends, and now have tents  
9 right up against their show windows.

10           Then there's the question of the bollards  
11 and the street trees, and how do you lay out the  
12 tents to make that all work properly? We end up  
13 with the number of tents that we have.

14           MS. CASARELLA: So what generated the  
15 splay of the façade?

16           MS. WEINSTEIN: It was pulled away, well  
17 first of all we wanted to create an urban plaza,  
18 so the question then became, well how do we do  
19 it? We looked at a lot of different  
20 possibilities, originally it was just internal to  
21 C Street, and this building came out to the  
22 corner. We realized that in order for this to



1 maintain itself as a lively urban plaza it didn't  
2 want to be tucked away; it wanted to be very open  
3 to all the foot traffic that happens around the  
4 market.

5 By pulling this plane of the building  
6 back from where the original Hine School came to,  
7 which was right here, it opens up the view of the  
8 historic iconic Eastern Market, and brings that  
9 as one of the defining elements architecturally,  
10 urbanistically into the Plaza.

11 MS. CASARELLA: Okay. I know in the  
12 Staff report the number of tents was not  
13 considered a concern of this Board, and that sort  
14 of thing.

15 Generally I feel that the Plaza, the  
16 space, the whole design of it, is there to  
17 support the Market. While it's not a strict  
18 preservation issue, it seems like there's still  
19 work to be done on how that Plaza does support  
20 the Market and the vendors. We've got a lot of  
21 comments from community groups that are concerned  
22 about that. I think there's more work to be done

1 on that issue.

2 I understand why you have certain  
3 limitations in the parameters that are driving  
4 the size of that, but I'm wondering if there's  
5 more thinking in the design that could support a  
6 larger number of tents.

7 MS. BUELL: The ANC pointed out that the  
8 Market now can support up to 140 tents, and it  
9 sounds like the size of the Market may be cut in  
10 half, is that true? Are the number of tents  
11 currently half?

12 MS. WEINSTEIN: We're currently showing  
13 68 tents on the Plaza there. The exact number,  
14 currently of the Market, first of all it  
15 fluctuates from Saturday to Sunday, and it  
16 fluctuates in good weather from bad weather. We  
17 have not done a very recent count. Back when we  
18 started this project we were told by one of the  
19 flea market managers that there were 120 tents at  
20 that time, and now we understand that there are  
21 more filling that playground.

22 MS. CASARELLA: Well it's the heart of the

1 project, and the genesis of the project is the  
2 adjacency to the market, so it seems like there's  
3 still some work to be done.

4 I do have some more questions. In the  
5 plans, and I just want to make sure I understand  
6 where, and maybe it's just something in the  
7 drawings. At the top of the plan there seems to  
8 be something, some lines here that indicate  
9 steps, I'm not sure what that refers to? I'm  
10 looking at L03 on the landscape plans, and I  
11 think it shows up on the larger landscape plan  
12 that we received. Is that any obstruction on the  
13 street?

14 MS. WEINSTEIN: No that's below grade.

15 MS. CASARELLA: I just want to make sure  
16 I understand that.

17 MS. WEINSTEIN: It's utility work and  
18 it's below grade.

19 MS. CASARELLA: Okay. Just getting into  
20 the details of the water fountain, so what  
21 happens to the fountains during the winter, what  
22 are you looking at when they're off?

1 MS. DELPLACE: Well, the idea behind the  
2 water fountains is that a traditional fountain  
3 which has a very deep basin is basically emptied  
4 in the winter time, and so you have the structure  
5 of the fountain but no water in a deep basin.  
6 So, these would actually be carved stone, and  
7 quite shallow, so that they almost appear like a  
8 big bench rather than a deep basin that's empty  
9 of water.

10 MS. CASARELLA: So they're just raised  
11 stone elements?

12 MS. DELPLACE: Yes, uh-huh.

13 MR. SANDERMAN: But the question wasn't  
14 answered, what will you do during the wintertime?

15 MS. DELPLACE: Well it's actually a  
16 platform for many things that could happen which  
17 is really on the program side, so for instance it  
18 could be a display, seasonal display, but it  
19 won't have the water in it. Although, we have  
20 explored looking at a modest heater you could  
21 actually get steam that would come off of them in  
22 the wintertime, so we're still looking at them.

1 MS. CASARELLA: Okay, that's all my  
2 questions.

3 MS. BUELL: Bob did you have any  
4 questions?

5 MR. SONDERMAN: I'm on sort of cognitive  
6 overload at the present. I'm working through how  
7 the plaza has a historic preservation component  
8 to it, and whether it has one or not, and whether  
9 or not we should be debating that, or the number  
10 of vendors that can be on there, so I'm just  
11 going to let that one slide.

12 I think the addition of the cornices  
13 helps a lot, I think your response to the Capitol  
14 Hill Restoration Society is helpful, and I'm just  
15 waiting, I'm just going to sit and listen to my  
16 architecture of colleagues follow through on  
17 this.

18 MS. BUELL: Okay, we were just going to  
19 ask questions. Okay we'll reserve our comments  
20 until after everyone is able to testify. Elinor  
21 do you have any questions?

22 MS. BACON: No questions.

1 MS. BUELL: Joseph?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Nope.

3 MS. BUELL: Okay. Well we'll go ahead  
4 and move on to the ANC, thank you for your  
5 letters they were very helpful. We will reserve  
6 additional comments until after everyone comes  
7 and testifies.

8 If you could go ahead and give us an  
9 overview, and particularly, if you could talk  
10 about the process, because one of the comments  
11 that was raised by the ANC is the timing for  
12 review of the plans, and just how community  
13 outreach has been handled. So if we could  
14 understand that, a little bit better, because  
15 it's very important to this Board, that would be  
16 helpful.

17 MR. FISHBERG: Thank you, my name is Ivan  
18 Fishberg I'm the Vice Chair of ANC 6-B, and  
19 represent ANC 6-B-O-2 which includes the Hine  
20 Development site. I am testifying this morning  
21 on behalf of the Commission.

22 You'll actually hear a little bit later

1 from my colleague Brian Pate who is going to  
2 speak to the second memo that you got on some of  
3 the process concerns, and overall observations  
4 about the last few months on this.

5           So, I'm going to go first, I think you'll  
6 hear other public testimony and then what we  
7 talked about with Steve and Amanda is that once  
8 we've dealt with the substance of what you have  
9 before you, then we'll sort of address those  
10 other process issues.

11           On July 26, we approved by a vote of 9 to  
12 0 with no abstentions, the following positions,  
13 which are the official positions of the  
14 Commission with respect to the elements of the  
15 project before you today.

16           The Commission believes that first on  
17 general landscaping that was presented, we  
18 believe that the landscaping plan enlivens the  
19 streetscape of the development.

20           The use of mature trees to augment  
21 existing trees compliments the tree canopy on all  
22 the streets.

1           The plan for the 8<sup>th</sup> Street apartment  
2 building landscaping is in keeping with the  
3 general style found at many residential parts of,  
4 The Capitol Hill Historic District.

5           We note that the plan to alternate mature  
6 Oaks with bollards on C Street reduces the  
7 intrusiveness of the bollards, while clearly  
8 delineating the road bed from the pedestrian  
9 sidewalk. This method also allows the developers  
10 to maintain the plaza on a single plane, which we  
11 concur, contributes to the openness and multiuse  
12 aspect of the space.

13           One comment for further design work going  
14 forward, the plan calls for in their description;  
15 narrow bins of cobbles knit together - - narrow  
16 bins of cobbles to knit together the brick  
17 sidewalk and the plaza paving.

18           The objective, we believe sound, but it  
19 is not clear that the current pattern or  
20 striations, and varied widths of the bins  
21 achieves the desired effect, and we believe  
22 requires some more attention.



1           The water features as you've been talking  
2 about this morning, also promised to engage  
3 pedestrians using the space, however, some  
4 moderate stepped elevation of the features, in  
5 line with the gradual increase in size, may be  
6 desirable, this would mirror the increasing  
7 height from east to west of the development  
8 itself.

9           I will now turn my attention to the C  
10 Street Plaza. While the plaza itself has not  
11 changed since February, the number of tents is  
12 depicted to support has changed from presentation  
13 to presentation. We felt it was important to  
14 present background on this as it relates to the  
15 site plan.

16           The RFP plans depicted support for over  
17 100 tents. The plans presented in February 2011,  
18 depicted 72 tents, and the latest design depicts  
19 68 tents. The current weekend market supports up  
20 to 140 or more tents, these are the same, I  
21 think, universally described 10 by 10 tents. Our  
22 count of 140 was done by a Commissioner on a

1 typical weekend. I think the market folks, that  
2 actually run the weekend market, now say that  
3 there's capacity up to 150 or so. Clearly, there  
4 has been a migration downward of the space, but  
5 there has also been an expansion of the market to  
6 fill the space that's been available over that  
7 time.

8           While the Board has given preliminary  
9 approval to the overall site plan, the apparent  
10 reduction of the weekend market space, and the  
11 change of the courtyard from public to private  
12 space, suggests that the Board might want to  
13 review alternate configurations that would meet  
14 the terms of the city agreement, and respond to  
15 community input.

16           Speaking just for myself, as we've not  
17 had an opportunity to review the Staff report  
18 formally, I would like to thank their attention  
19 to this matter, and understanding that it might  
20 require further review.

21           Turning to the Plaza Building, the façade  
22 on the C Street hotel residential building is a

1 positive development enhancing the open space,  
2 and creating a lighter and more engaging façade  
3 with the welcome addition of a few curbs,  
4 especially that's much appreciated on my part.

5           The gradation of color from the base of  
6 the building to the top, ranging from darker  
7 stone at the base, to the lighter stone at the  
8 top, warms the buildings and additions of a  
9 cornice completes the affect.

10           The 7<sup>th</sup> Street façade of the building  
11 expresses measured and complete symmetry along  
12 the bay window placement, and rounded elements of  
13 the window treatments.

14           However, we found that C Street may  
15 benefit, the C Street side of the building may  
16 benefit from additional effort to achieve the  
17 same symmetry, especially on the corner of 7<sup>th</sup> and  
18 C, on the C side façade. This section has become  
19 a little bit crowded at this corner, and the last  
20 large section loses alignment with the otherwise  
21 unifying round window lintel.

22           Additionally, the C Street entrance

1 requires some additional design detail, and I  
2 will note that the Commission has no objection to  
3 the height, and mass of the Plaza Building.

4           Some of our more significant concerns  
5 relate to the North Residential Building, at 44  
6 feet to the roof line, and 50 feet at the  
7 mechanical penthouse, the dominant height of this  
8 more than 4 story building sits 20 feet across  
9 from a 2 story house that is the first among  
10 blocks of 6 modest 2 story homes.

11           While the façade of the 3 story section  
12 might be appropriate to the adjacent houses, the  
13 4 story section of the building appears to crowd  
14 the 2 story houses across from it. We would  
15 suggest increasing the fourth floor setback from  
16 the 8<sup>th</sup> street to midblock.

17           We had begun conversations with the  
18 developers on this matter in the context of our  
19 public meetings but recommend that they  
20 discontinue further design work to address the  
21 height problem that is in that section.

22           I need to emphasize here, I think

1 historic, it's a jump from 2 stories to 4 stories  
2 is a lot. In the context of a full road width  
3 regular, kind of Capitol Hill Street it might not  
4 be that significant, but across from a very  
5 narrow 20 foot alley way, that represents a very  
6 significant jump up. For the setback you start  
7 to address some of those problems, and we look  
8 forward to figuring out if there's ways to  
9 accomplish that.

10           The proposed height of the four story  
11 section is a two foot reduction from previous  
12 plans, which, as Amy noted, comes, or I think may  
13 have noted, it comes at the expense of a small  
14 setback in the first floor, along the east-west  
15 alley.

16           In previous plans it presented a little  
17 indentation along the alleyway to allow trucks to  
18 come in and park, and address what I think is an  
19 anticipated overcrowding problem. The setback is  
20 functionally critical to what is expected to be  
21 that high volume of light trucks, and service  
22 vehicles that attend to both 7<sup>th</sup> Street buildings,

1 and what would be the C Street building.

2           Again, we think this is a problem, and  
3 the possible solution requires further  
4 investigation before reaching approval. Even  
5 though the rear of the building is along a  
6 service alley, it is public space that is easily  
7 viewed from the market itself, the residential  
8 buildings, and the perpendicular alley that runs  
9 between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Streets. This deserves a  
10 little bit more consideration in terms of the  
11 design detail.

12           Finally, the west façade of the 8<sup>th</sup>  
13 Street building is well designed, particularly in  
14 light of their accommodations to CHRS invocative  
15 of the local level design, at the heart of this  
16 neighborhood.

17           Thank you for the opportunity to share  
18 our positions. I'm happy to answer any  
19 questions.

20           MS. BUELL: Thank you. Okay, is your  
21 colleague here to talk about the community  
22 process?

1           MR. FISHBERG: He was juggling his  
2   schedule, and I told him that he should be here  
3   around 10:00 anticipating sort of the flow of  
4   things. So, if he's not here, then I'll step in  
5   once you concluded other public testimony.

6           MS. BUELL: Okay, perfect. If we could  
7   have everyone else who's come to testify, if you  
8   could just start to move forward. Are there  
9   other people here to testify? Thank you.

10           One of the things that I'd like to note,  
11   we received a number of letters raising concerns  
12   about the community process, so we will talk  
13   about that.

14           But, also the timing of the community  
15   remarks, and as we move forward through our  
16   schedule I just want to make sure that it's clear  
17   from this Board that our intent is not to cutoff  
18   any of the community members, or not to hear your  
19   concerns.

20           We appreciate all of the letters, all of  
21   the time you take, the fact that you come down  
22   here, you care so much, and you express your

1 views, I think it helps for a better project.

2 But, we have a timed agenda and  
3 sometimes we have to move out of the room. So, we  
4 will work to make sure that everybody is heard,  
5 and it is not our intent to cut anybody off.

6 I'm very active in my own community, and  
7 I understand how important your feedback is, and  
8 we really value it. I just want to make sure  
9 that is clear, for myself, and also the other  
10 Board Members. We appreciate you taking the time  
11 to come down here and share your thoughts.

12 So, if we can go ahead and get started.

13 MS. CONNELLY: My name is Marian  
14 Connelly, and this is my third appearance before  
15 you to speak on behalf of 22 households,  
16 numbering 36 individuals, who live immediately  
17 north of the Hine parcel, and on some of the  
18 adjoining streets. I think, by now you're well  
19 aware that we've had some strong concerns, and  
20 serious issues with the project.

21 Today you're considering the portion of  
22 the proposed development that will most directly



1   affect those of us who live nearest to the north  
2   end of the project.  It will also, and I'm not  
3   trying to speak for them, but just to remind you,  
4   it will affect residents in the 600 block of C  
5   Street, as well as 8<sup>th</sup> Street residents, some  
6   residents on 7<sup>th</sup> Street the 200 block, and of  
7   course all the businesses along 7<sup>th</sup> Street,  
8   including the market.

9           I submitted a letter on our behalf dated  
10   July 27, which I hope you had a chance to look  
11   at.

12           So, I'm just going to highlight a few  
13   points, and I will say it's always good to get  
14   here when Amy is starting her presentation  
15   because we invariably get new information.

16           So there are a few things that I want to  
17   try to speak to that we hadn't seen before.  
18   They're responsive to comments so I'm not  
19   criticizing, just that we didn't have advance  
20   notice of some of these changes.

21           Like HPRB, we find the C Street façade,  
22   and the main entrance to the North Building

1 Apartments rather stark. I don't know any other  
2 word to use, I've looked up other synonyms and  
3 nothing seems to work other than it's just too  
4 stark when compared to the livelier midsection of  
5 that building, and to the homes and businesses  
6 that surround the space. So we recommend further  
7 design work as a number of others have, on that  
8 entrance. We're pleased to hear Amy indicate  
9 today that they concur in that.

10           The rear of the North Residential  
11 Building is highly visible from 8<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup>  
12 Streets, and yet there's been no effort to  
13 present anything other than a plain wall of  
14 windows. It's nice to have the wraparound cornice  
15 but, it doesn't quite provide the treatment that  
16 we think it's worth when you're coming down 8<sup>th</sup>  
17 Street, or standing on 7<sup>th</sup> Street. Some of you  
18 have been there and you know that it's a very  
19 visible piece of land on the backside.

20           Despite the addition of the new site line  
21 images, which we had not seen before, and we  
22 haven't really had a chance to look at them and

1 try to get our own orientation to them, we all  
2 feel that the North Building looms over the  
3 alley, and the adjacent homes.

4           We're very pleased that the architect has  
5 reduced some height, originally she said by two  
6 feet, but today given the parapet that she's  
7 added; it ends up being only six inches, which is  
8 not much of a response to our concerns about  
9 height.

10           The Plaza Building is much improved, we  
11 still question its height, vis-a-vis the market  
12 and the lower 7<sup>th</sup> Street streetscape, and it's a  
13 little questionable in our mind.

14           We're also concerned about the noise that  
15 may emanate in the neighborhood from the  
16 balconies, they overhang the public plaza. We  
17 wonder how use of those balconies may affect  
18 residents in the south facing units looking at  
19 the North Residential Building, I hope that's  
20 clear.

21           With regard to the public plaza, the  
22 landscape plan presented along with these

1 revisions will markedly help how this development  
2 interfaces with existing neighborhood residences,  
3 and other historic structures.

4           We're pleased with the plans for front  
5 gardens on 8<sup>th</sup> Street, the Hairpin fences. We  
6 would recommend that in addition to year around  
7 plantings that priority also be given to drought  
8 tolerant native plants.

9           We also like the addition of large canopy  
10 trees, and water features along C Street and the  
11 public plaza. However, the water features, and  
12 the bollards take up space that was previously  
13 allocated to the weekend flea markets.

14           We're deeply concerned about the major  
15 reduction in space for the weekend flea markets,  
16 which have been the major economic engine in  
17 supporting Eastern Market, and surrounding  
18 businesses for over a decade.

19           The current plan does not appear to honor  
20 the widespread understanding throughout the  
21 community that the Hine Redevelopment Project  
22 would ensure the continuation of the Saturday and

1 Sunday flea markets.

2           We joined the Eastern Market Citizens  
3 Advisory Committee and others in asking that the  
4 site plan, and the conceptual designs be revised,  
5 to ensure the continuation of the flea markets at  
6 their current size.

7           We also would appreciate some explanation  
8 of the phrase that Amy has used today, that's  
9 also been in some of their recent literature,  
10 about special events and activities that would be  
11 programmed for the C Street Plaza, we don't know  
12 what these might be, and it makes us nervous.

13           We also continue to have major concerns  
14 about weekend pedestrian safety, traffic volumes,  
15 and emergency vehicle access, at the intersection  
16 of 8<sup>th</sup> and C, especially the competition between  
17 market shoppers on foot with strollers, bikes,  
18 and other conveyances, and the vehicles on the C  
19 Street road bed at the garage entrance.

20           We're finding it difficult to see how the  
21 landscape plan will prevent pedestrians from  
22 streaming down the middle of the street going to

1 and from the market on the weekends, and putting  
2 themselves at being hit by vehicles that are  
3 coming and going into the garage.

4 Finally, we're extremely disappointed to  
5 find that this design prevents any public access  
6 to the interior courtyard which is the only green  
7 space in the project which might have been  
8 available to the public.

9 We find it puzzling that HPRB does not  
10 consider the contributions of all these uses, and  
11 placements of garage entrances, and accessing  
12 whether a proposal is compatible with the values  
13 of the Historic District. I'm very heartened by  
14 your forthright acknowledgement of some of the  
15 challenges that this presents to you today.

16 Nevertheless, we assume that should  
17 subsequent decisions in the zoning process  
18 necessitate a change in the site plan that HPRB  
19 would take another look at the site plan, and  
20 give public notice that you are going to do so,  
21 so that those of us who are really interested,  
22 and engaged can weigh in if we so desire.

1           That concludes my testimony; I ask that  
2 my statement be made part of the record of  
3 today's meeting. Thank you.

4           MS. LAFOLLETTE: Thank you for the  
5 opportunity to speak this morning; I'm Marcel  
6 Lafollette, an Historian, and President of the  
7 neighborhood group, Eyes on Hine.

8           You have I hope read the letters  
9 submitted last week by our members. These D.C.  
10 citizens have taken time from their busy lives,  
11 including the lives of new born parents to  
12 express their concerns about the Hine Project  
13 Development. Concerns that we know from  
14 conversations with friends, and professional  
15 colleagues, are shared by many residents.

16           We entered our discussions this spring in  
17 the spirit of classic American optimism. We  
18 supported a mixed use development on this piece  
19 of public land.

20           Now however, many are questioning the  
21 wisdom of our earlier support. We are  
22 questioning whether the buildings as currently

1 designed with such disproportionately large  
2 historically incompatible buildings, will indeed  
3 be an asset to our community.

4           The level of skepticism is high for a  
5 number of reasons relating specifically to  
6 historic preservation.

7           For example; separating approval of the  
8 height and massing of project buildings from  
9 other elements of the project has ignored how  
10 such an enormous complex will impact the entire  
11 Eastern Market neighborhood.

12           The Plaza design compressed within the  
13 confined spaces of two inordinately tall  
14 buildings provides inadequate space for a flea  
15 market that has had a longstanding space there,  
16 and is vital to the economic sustainability of  
17 Eastern Market, and the Barracks Row businesses.

18           The inadequately sized Plaza also  
19 portends a future of unwelcome, and potentially  
20 dangerous overcrowding, on the weekends.

21           The proposed height, size, and massing of  
22 the North Building are in appropriate for a



1 structure so close to existing, and historic  
2 residences.

3           The parking garage entrance on C Street  
4 threatens increased, not lessened congestion,  
5 with potential dangers to pedestrians, to traffic  
6 flow along 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and the efficient and rapid  
7 transit of fire trucks and other emergency  
8 vehicles.

9           All of the proposed structures, each with  
10 large visible mechanical penthouses will loom  
11 over adjacent blocks producing unwelcome canyon  
12 affects on 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and the reopened C Street.

13           Preservation of the treasured character  
14 of this Capitol Hill neighborhood demands a  
15 substantial reduction in the size, and mass of  
16 this development.

17           In July 2011, the Historic Preservation  
18 Office released two sets of draft guidelines.  
19 These documents declare that Historic District  
20 designation should be used, and I quote; "as the  
21 means to recognize, and preserve areas whose  
22 significance lies primarily in the character of

1 the community as a whole". And yet it is  
2 preservation of the character of our neighborhood  
3 which has been ignored in actions to date.

4 The newly stated goals call for  
5 protection and enhancement of views and Vistas,  
6 preservation of historic skylines, and historic  
7 open spaces, and yet our calls for just such  
8 protection have been dismissed.

9 The guidelines emphasize, and I quote;  
10 "the need to preserve the record of our own time,  
11 including significant examples of midcentury  
12 modernism". Yet HPO remarks seem to delight in  
13 marking snide references to non-contributing  
14 structures along 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

15 The proposed guidelines call for  
16 involving the public, and for ensuring that,  
17 again quote; "the views of the public are  
18 solicited, and given careful consideration," and  
19 they suggest that residents and city  
20 professionals support each other through an open  
21 dialog, sharing information, perspectives, and  
22 expertise.

1           As a voter and taxpayer, I urge you to  
2 live up to those high standards in the future,  
3 even though as a Historian, and accidental  
4 community activist, I cannot help but bemoan how  
5 they've been ignored in the past. Thank you for  
6 your attention.

7           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hear, Hear!

8           MS. DIENER: I'm sorry this is somewhat  
9 off the cuff remarks, my name is Robin Diener,  
10 I'm the Director of Citywide Library Renaissance  
11 Project, and I've taken an interest in this  
12 actually because of the proximity of the library,  
13 the Historic Library to the Eastern Market  
14 Square, and development here by Stanton Eastbanc,  
15 and my friendship with several people who live  
16 nearby.

17           I'll be very brief, but if I bring  
18 something of a citywide perspective to this my  
19 observations of what has gone on I hope will be  
20 somewhat relevant to you. At any rate I will  
21 strive to be very brief.

22           Libraries are drivers of economic

1 development, so as we've developed new libraries  
2 all around the city we've had many similar  
3 conversations about this, and the library has  
4 done actually a superb job on the Historic  
5 Library, so kudos to the city for that.

6 But, the process that we use for planning  
7 these things is very divisive, I know that's not  
8 your concern here today, but I will just  
9 interject it. It is a very, very divisive  
10 community.

11 Can we start with these cards, what's up  
12 with this, Proponent or opponent? No one that I  
13 have spoken to is opposed to the redevelopment of  
14 the Hine site, so it's kind of hard to understand  
15 why this is a starting point, just a minor thing.

16 It's a citywide issue, not just in this  
17 case, of course. I would like to say I'm so  
18 impressed with the public that comes to speak,  
19 taking the time out of their day, and then puts  
20 the time into endless meetings in their  
21 community, the ANC, and I know you're very  
22 familiar with this, and that you do give

1 deference to it, but it is extraordinary.

2           I have heard, this is the start of the  
3 fourth hearing that we've now had on this, over  
4 and over again, the same thing from the  
5 community, from the concerned and interested and  
6 involved community that it's too big, it's too  
7 massive, it's incompatible. I don't see that  
8 those are really being addressed except in rather  
9 dazzling, and quite lovely detail by an  
10 extraordinary architect, Amy Weinstein who  
11 everyone quite admires.

12           But, are we really to the stage to the  
13 details that we're discussing when you haven't  
14 addressed, I feel, the basic problems of public  
15 land that is being taken for development, this  
16 ridiculous courtyard, which is 100 percent  
17 private and is not green space, it's some trees.

18           There's no connection to Barracks Row,  
19 which is already on Capitol Hill, and is  
20 something in need of assistance, and enhancement.

21       No connection at all whatsoever to the library  
22 which is right there on an opposite corner, again

1 no green space. I'm very surprised about the  
2 number of tents for the flea market because the  
3 enhancement, as you suggested, no it was Maria,  
4 of the adjacency of Eastern Market is so  
5 important to this, the heart of the project, as I  
6 think she said.

7           Anyway, I'm a little off the cuff here,  
8 and I apologize, and I will send you remarks in  
9 writing, but I do wish you would take in to  
10 account, if you could step back for a minute, and  
11 address the larger issue of how the public is  
12 getting anything out of this, other than what  
13 they already have, which are sidewalks, trees,  
14 and some space for tents for a flea market.

15           We're taking away an enormous amount of  
16 public property, giving it to private interests,  
17 this is not in, and of itself wrong in anyway,  
18 and I don't think anyone is suggesting that.

19           We need to get the maximum out of this  
20 that we can for the public good, and that is not  
21 simply economic development. There are many ways  
22 to achieve that, and I don't think we've gotten

1 to that in this plan. Thank you for listening to  
2 me.

3 MR. JENSICK: Madam Chairman and Members  
4 of the Board. Madam Chairman and Members of the  
5 Board my remarks too, are extemporary and yes I  
6 had no intention of speaking today, but I felt  
7 that I needed to because it looks like this will  
8 be the last opportunity.

9 My name is Larry Jensick; I live at 1012  
10 South Carolina Avenue, SE. I'm Secretary of  
11 EMMCA (Eastern Market Metro Community  
12 Association), but I want to emphasize that I'm  
13 speaking on behalf of myself today.

14 I'm afraid it will not be as eloquent as  
15 the person who preceded me, and I admire and  
16 endorse her remarks. I also want to say that I  
17 support the 8<sup>th</sup> Street residents, the members of  
18 Eyes on Hine, and the position of the ANC.

19 Last month at the HPRB hearing a number  
20 of organizations, and residents, gave their  
21 unqualified endorsement to the Hine site, a small  
22 number.

1           While we support the development, and I  
2   wanted to see something positive to the Hine  
3   site, I just want to emphasize that somebody has  
4   to say that something's going to be lost, what's  
5   going to be lost is the community integrity,  
6   community diversity, and the residential  
7   orientation of the neighborhood.

8           I don't believe that HPRB process has  
9   served the community well on this project. While  
10   these things are a matter of perception, I  
11   believe that the role of government should be to  
12   be on the side of the citizen and to give the  
13   benefit of the doubt to the citizen. In this  
14   case I think the Board is too often given the  
15   benefit of the doubt to the developer. That  
16   concludes my statement, thank you.

17           MS. BUELL: I'm sorry if we can make sure  
18   that we can limit the outbursts and make sure  
19   that we limit our comments to comments to the  
20   Board, just so we can maintain some order, and  
21   also respect for everybody who has come to  
22   testify and present today.



1 MS. BLAIR: Hello, my name is Wendy  
2 Blair, I'm a member of Eyes on Hine, I live at  
3 316 8<sup>th</sup> Street, SE.

4 Why are you considering the Hine  
5 Development Project, piecemeal? Is it because it  
6 is too big to consider as a whole? I believe  
7 that it is all a whole, and that it is too big,  
8 too massive, and too tall, and that we are  
9 getting away from that overview that Robin  
10 mentioned.

11 This is the third hearing that you're  
12 having on this. It's named an overflow hearing;  
13 it is not fully open to the public, live  
14 streaming, or video tape. Therefore the general  
15 public is not fully involved as the other 2  
16 hearings were.

17 At the first hearing you limited us  
18 members of the neighborhood to 3 minutes apiece,  
19 and there were no questions of us, at all from  
20 your 6 member a bare quorum Board at that time.  
21 There were no questions of Amy Weinstein, and you  
22 voted unanimously to accept the site plan at that

1 time. You gave 1 ½ hours of close questioning to  
2 the people of the White Tiger Restaurant about  
3 some small windows that were projecting onto the  
4 streetscape. You gave us 1 ½ hours for this  
5 very, very large development.

6 At the second hearing which I could not  
7 attend because this is happening over the summer,  
8 and many of us have had to be away, it also was a  
9 great limitation, I understand and you voted  
10 unanimously to accept the site plan.

11 This has been characterized, these  
12 hearings often as do give consideration to the  
13 people who live near, but they are nimbi. It is  
14 important to consider development for the city as  
15 a whole. Who better to tell you about the effect  
16 on our neighborhood than the people who are most  
17 affected, and who live near? The people in favor  
18 do not live near.

19 It does destroy because of its  
20 massiveness and size a great deal of the  
21 character of Capitol Hill, notwithstanding the  
22 brilliant and knowledgeable and thoughtful plans

1 of Amy Weinstein. This is a taking from us of a  
2 large amount of public space. There is no public  
3 space here, you've given a small amount to the  
4 flea market, but we already have a much larger  
5 space for the flea market.

6 We have suggested one way that we the  
7 public could have some public space, and that is  
8 to take away that private inner courtyard and  
9 reconfigure so that there is more open space for  
10 the general public available to it.

11 We have also suggested that the  
12 connection between Historic Eastern Market, and  
13 the Barracks Row, and the Metro Plaza is cut off.  
14 Even through Stanton said in its vision  
15 statement that it was supposedly trying to unify  
16 those 2, and connect those 2 important commercial  
17 places. You haven't commented on that, instead  
18 we have a public avenue to the Eastern Market  
19 along C Street which is a very minor thing, which  
20 the large amount of tourists and people visiting  
21 the space from other neighborhoods do not come  
22 to; they come along 7<sup>th</sup> Street from Pennsylvania

1 Avenue.

2           We plan to appeal to our Council Member  
3 Tommy Wells, about the devastating impact of this  
4 development, too large, too tall, too massive, on  
5 our historic neighborhood, hoping and looking to  
6 him to listen to us, as you have not frankly.  
7 That's the end of my statement.

8           MS. OPPERWINER: My name is Ellen  
9 Opperwiner, you've seen me before, and this is my  
10 third visit to the hearing. I really don't want  
11 to dump all over you all, but I do want to talk  
12 about process just a little bit.

13           Some of you may know I served on the  
14 Alcoholic Beverage Control Board for 4 years, not  
15 that long ago, 99' to 2003.

16           The first time I came here I never felt I  
17 was treated so badly, I was stunned, I didn't get  
18 to finish my statement, it felt as if you didn't  
19 want to hear from me, and the others that were  
20 sitting at the table. It's been hard to overcome  
21 that.

22           More importantly this project is a huge

1 major development in our neighborhood. I live at  
2 223 10<sup>th</sup> Street, SE; I've lived there for 30 years  
3 in that house and 3 more years on 9<sup>th</sup> Street, in  
4 the 300 block.

5           This project is huge, we have not had  
6 sufficient time or opportunity to weigh in, and  
7 why do I say that? I had to work my way in to  
8 get involved with the groups on 8<sup>th</sup> Street, there  
9 were no meetings held by the developers for the  
10 rest of the community. Thank goodness the  
11 Restoration Society held a huge public meeting  
12 which I attended, which I learned more about the  
13 project at that particular meeting, I didn't  
14 really know much.

15           I think that the shortness of time to  
16 evaluate a very complicated proposal,  
17 particularly by those of us who are not  
18 architects, who are students of historic  
19 preservation, but I am, and I agree with much of  
20 what's been said today. I'm a long term resident  
21 of the neighborhood that I've grown to love, and  
22 I'm staying there and it is a historic

1 neighborhood, and therefore I think there's  
2 certain requirements.

3           This project could, very potentially  
4 overwhelm us and change the neighborhood in ways  
5 that may not be appropriate, we've heard about  
6 the lack of public green space, I think that's a  
7 very serious problem in what had been a  
8 commitment in the planning process.

9           There's been very little give and take.  
10 We get presented, we hear the developer, we then  
11 get a chance to say a few words, or write a  
12 letter, or whatever, and I haven't had time this  
13 month to do so, but I have in the past.

14           We don't have any give and take on it;  
15 there aren't any questions of us that come from  
16 the neighborhood, or even across the city. This  
17 project is going to affect far more than 8<sup>th</sup>  
18 Street.

19           I think traffic, the pedestrian safety;  
20 all those issues will become relevant here, so  
21 when one is doing a very large project. I'll say  
22 one more thing, but I really hope that we can

1 open this project up before a final decision is  
2 made.

3 I was flabbergasted that you all made a  
4 unilateral majority, or I think it was a  
5 unanimous decision to approve a project about  
6 which there were so many questions raised, and it  
7 can't help but that we would feel that we weren't  
8 listened to. We had raised concerns which didn't  
9 come up in conversation.

10 I asked Amanda Molson, do you all  
11 deliberate together, before you make a decision,  
12 because that's what we did on the ABC Board. The  
13 answer was no, I'm floored by that, because I  
14 think there's a synergy of conversation that  
15 happens from varying perspectives that will give  
16 a best decision rather than each of you  
17 individually speaking just publically in response  
18 to what you've read, to what you know, what  
19 you've seen, and of course your background and  
20 professional skills. I'm troubled by that.

21 I'm also troubled that we say well we're  
22 not supposed to deal with this, and yet the uses

1 issue that have been proposed by the developer  
2 have been accepted as gospel, and I'll point you  
3 the last paragraph of the Staff's report.

4           Assuming that all of the proposed retail  
5 spaces will be retail spaces, we will have, as  
6 you all know a PUD process coming up, at which  
7 uses will be decided. So it seems to me  
8 contradictory to be making a decision with  
9 certain assumptions, when in fact, that may not  
10 be the case.

11           Now whether it fits in historically, and  
12 by the way I also have great regard for the  
13 architect, I happen not to like most of this  
14 project, I think it's poorly done in some ways;  
15 the North Building front façade was vastly  
16 improved. The back looks a lot like a  
17 correctional facility. I happen to go to  
18 correctional facilities, so I'm familiar with  
19 them. I was struck by the picture today. This  
20 is going to be seen by the people behind the  
21 North Building.

22           I don't think, and I think Ms. Connelly's



1 polite comments were very appropriate, if not  
2 just a bit too polite. It doesn't match what the  
3 neighborhood ought to get.

4 I think the Plaza Building is much too  
5 busy, much too confusing. The architect actually  
6 said something like that, it doesn't quite  
7 cohere, and that's my opinion.

8 It's not what I do for a living, I don't  
9 know much about it, and I do have pretty good  
10 taste. So, I would really like - - I don't know  
11 what we can do from here, but I do think you  
12 should know that a large segment of the public  
13 has not been consulted, and has not been engaged  
14 in this process by the developer.

15 Our ANC has worked unbelievably hard; all  
16 the members have been engaged. I've been in that  
17 neighborhood 33 years, I've never seen anything  
18 like it, and yet we're not sure we're  
19 communicating effectively with you in order to  
20 inform your decision and to give you a better  
21 opportunity to make a right decision for our  
22 neighborhood. Thanks so much for listening.

1 MS. BUELL: Thank you. Is there anybody  
2 else who's come to testify? Please come forward.

3 MR. STERNLIEB: Good morning I'm Joe  
4 Sternlieb, I one of the project members. I just  
5 want to address one thing on process without  
6 getting into details.

7 We're very respectful of what you have to  
8 say, we've been trying to listen to responses, we  
9 don't bring community members into our internal  
10 working meetings, but I can ensure everybody that  
11 every comment we take down, and we think about,  
12 we try to understand where folks are coming from.

13 We're also trying to respond to the city  
14 about the RFP, we spent a year negotiating a very  
15 lengthy, some onerous disposition agreement.

16 The city I assure you, is not giving us  
17 the land. In fact, I think this is one of the  
18 largest projects in the city that's asking for no  
19 city subsidy of any kind.

20 It's providing an enormous number of  
21 benefits out of the land value, and that we  
22 create a very high requirement for affordable

1 housing, the development of the plaza,  
2 underground parking, and the interruption of  
3 infrastructure with no subsidy or tax breaks.

4 In order to do that there was a certain  
5 amount of density the city required us to try and  
6 achieve; we're trying to achieve that.

7 What I want to say though in terms of  
8 processing the amount of time. We try to be  
9 extremely respectful of the community.

10 I think that we've now been to, I want to  
11 say either been to, held, or attended other  
12 people who invited us in, a little over 30  
13 community meetings over the last 2 years. We've  
14 been to the ANC, 3 times, 4 times now for full  
15 presentation, and special called meetings, and  
16 regular scheduled meetings have met 3 or 4 times  
17 with the Capitol Hill Restoration Society.

18 We've invited Eyes on Hine, the 8<sup>th</sup>  
19 Street Neighbors, and EMMCA, into the Stanton  
20 Office at least 3 or 4 times over the last few  
21 months. We also made it clear that anytime any  
22 individual's members who can't make the meetings

1 want to come in and meet with us, we're happy to  
2 have them come in. The office is right across  
3 the street from the Hine site.

4 We've met once with a couple of the  
5 market managers from other towns with a couple  
6 other market managers to try and get their input.

7 We're trying as hard as we can; there are only  
8 so many days in a year. We have a very tight  
9 schedule.

10 I do want folks to know that we have made  
11 every effort to be open, to hear comments, to  
12 responding to them, and to come out to the  
13 community on a very regular basis. I think we  
14 try to be as responsive as we can be given the  
15 other constraints that are outside of the  
16 immediate Historic Preservation concerns.

17 So, I just want to put that on the record  
18 on behalf of the development.

19 MS. BUELL: Okay, thank you. Good  
20 morning, yes please.

21 MS. WRIGHT: Thank you, my name is Carole  
22 Wright, I own the Saturday Flea Market on the

1 Hine site. I have been in business in  
2 Washington, DC since 1970, continuously. I have  
3 had numerous areas of the city experienced with  
4 my business. I don't believe there would be any  
5 other area in the entire city where a project of  
6 this size would require a flea market to be  
7 included, that's how popular our market has  
8 become.

9           We answered in 1997, a request from the  
10 Control Board to raise money on school site  
11 locations and we have paid for 24 hours a week  
12 use, the weekends over \$700,000 to the city in  
13 fees, additional fees, and Homeland Security.  
14 Everything that's been required of us we've  
15 honored to the letter since 1997, both markets.

16           We have become not just a market place,  
17 but a community place. We have hosted over 250  
18 charity events, and the fact that they don't have  
19 to spend one single cent; there is no fee to  
20 attend our markets. People walk their dogs, walk  
21 their baby carriages, and enjoy this as "public  
22 space".

1           We endorse the selection of Eastbanc  
2   Stanton by collecting petitions, names, sending  
3   emails, we sent thousands of letters from people  
4   shopping our market to the mayor requesting that  
5   this particular developer be chosen, and we are  
6   100 percent behind Stanton Eastbanc as the  
7   developer chosen. However, until this week our  
8   flea market which has been diminished by 50  
9   percent, we silently attended all of the  
10   community meetings that Joe has referred to.  
11   They have been extremely open at the community  
12   meetings in showing the progress of the various  
13   plans, but as the plan has changed, our 120 to  
14   150 small businesses each day has been reduced  
15   now to 60 possible tents.

16           In a meeting just this week with the  
17   developer we brainstormed as much as possible,  
18   tried to make concessions in any way possible,  
19   and the only solution is a reduction of the  
20   massing or a change of the design.

21           The flea markets will not be able to  
22   continue as the community loves them, and will

1 come out in droves for them because of the  
2 massing and the design.

3 We have asked Amy, the architect to  
4 consider anything possible, their solution at  
5 this juncture is for us to close a public street  
6 and flow our market out onto a closed public  
7 street and that is not all the way back to the  
8 RFP what was expected of this project.

9 Each and every step of the way, and each  
10 and every one of the community meetings, and the  
11 private meetings that Joe just mentioned, the  
12 flea market has been brought to the front,  
13 because this is, the public space being used by  
14 that community, so strongly that many people  
15 bought homes in the community, are now raising  
16 small children in the community, which we did not  
17 have back in the early 90's.

18 That public space is integral to this  
19 project. We are hoping that your Board knowing  
20 that use is not essentially in any of your  
21 decision making, we're hoping that the size and  
22 the density will be somehow adjusted so that the

1 popular flea markets can continue on the weekends  
2 there. Thank you.

3 MS. BUELL: Thank you. Nancy.

4 MS. METZGER: Nancy Metzger, Capitol Hill  
5 Restoration Society.

6 We did submit a letter late, and I hope  
7 you've had a chance to talk to them, because I  
8 know that time is running out. So I'm not going  
9 to go over specific issues that we brought up  
10 because I think they will be looked at and  
11 addressed by Stanton as much as they can by Amy.

12 I would like to just talk briefly about  
13 the issues that have been brought up today. I  
14 think one of the things, and the Staff report  
15 mentions, of course the flea market issues, the  
16 transportation issues, are actually some others,  
17 but I think what people have said to me that  
18 really is very concerning to them is that they  
19 are so afraid that once a decision is made here  
20 about site plan and everything, if it will be  
21 used against them in the PUD process. I think  
22 that will at least inform the PUD process in a



1 way that they can't overcome.

2           This morning I was thinking that quite  
3 often the HPRB used to insert a little standard  
4 phrase, this decision in no way means that this  
5 should be used in the BZA thing as saying that  
6 this is approved by BZA process. I'm just  
7 wondering if we can't either in statement like  
8 that or in statement by the Board put that  
9 feeling across to both the community members and  
10 to the Zoning Commission as this process goes  
11 forward, and that these kinds of issues are  
12 addressed in the PUD process which is where they  
13 rightly should be.

14           MS. BUELL: Okay.

15           MS. METZGER: I think I'm just going to  
16 stop right now.

17           MS. BUELL: Thank you, thank you.

18           MR. PATE: My name is Brian Pate; I'm the  
19 Commissioner for ANC 6-B-0-5. I'm speaking to  
20 the Commission second communication to the Board,  
21 title; Observations on HPRB Process and Remaining  
22 Concerns.

1           This communication was voted on by the  
2 Commission and approved by a 6-3 vote on July  
3 26<sup>th</sup>, at our special call.

4           I'm going to hit 3 things quickly, one is  
5 our observations on the process, I'm going to  
6 catalog our remaining concerns and then just  
7 offer some thoughts on some conceptual areas that  
8 might be worth further discussion and  
9 intellectual development.

10           First our process observations; I think  
11 we all understand why this had to be broken up  
12 into chunks, it's very difficult to do in the  
13 amount of time you guys have, and it's more  
14 efficient to break it up into chunks. The risks  
15 though associated with breaking it up into chunks  
16 have to be acknowledged and there are essentially  
17 2 risks, one is that we missed some of the more  
18 universal and holistic aspects of the design,  
19 either positive or negative.

20           The second is there's a concern that some  
21 of the issues that were raised in previous HPO  
22 Staff reports and by the Board might get lost in

1 the rear view mirror as we move forward.

2 The other element of our observation on  
3 process is that there has been some exceedingly  
4 compressed timelines that have, I think, hindered  
5 complete synthesis and analysis of the design  
6 iterations by both the community and the ANC.

7 I'd over a mitigation strategy and that  
8 would be to just catalog the concerns that were  
9 listed out in the HPO reports and accepted as a  
10 part of your approval of the project, and to  
11 ensure that they are entered into the PUD  
12 process, and that they are part of the record and  
13 not lost. Those are our process observations.

14 Next I just want to catalog our remaining  
15 concerns, and I'll just kind of go through the  
16 list. I would also acknowledge that the  
17 developers have addressed many of our concerns,  
18 so I don't have a tally but probably over 50  
19 percent of our concerns were addressed in some  
20 form or fashion by the developers, and that's  
21 appreciated.

22 But, we did call for a reduced height or

1 setback at the entrance to the building on 8<sup>th</sup>  
2 Street. We asked for further design work at the  
3 roofline, and on the window treatments of this  
4 building. We also asked for a more comprehensive  
5 redesign or relook at the building at 8<sup>th</sup> and D  
6 Street, we felt like that was still incompatible  
7 with our neighborhood from a design aspect.

8           We asked for continued efforts to reduce  
9 the visual impact of the mechanical penthouses,  
10 something that's also echoed in the HPO Staff  
11 reports.

12           Then lastly the evolution of the  
13 courtyard from an open space in February of this  
14 year, to a completely enclosed, and private space  
15 is of great concern to us, and we still feel  
16 impacts, questions of massing, pedestrian access,  
17 and the potential future programming of the  
18 Plaza, so that remains a concern for us.

19           Lastly, it's just more of kind of an  
20 intellectual comment. In tackling this project  
21 we think it would be worth broader conversation  
22 about sustainability, transient, and design, and

1 historic preservation.

2           There are two kind of philosophies that  
3 kind of have some inherent tensions, and  
4 personally in my own research of this project,  
5 there's not a lot of academic or intellectual  
6 thinking about how to square the two  
7 philosophies, there's a lot on how to green  
8 existing historic buildings, and ensure that they  
9 become green compliant, but there's not a lot  
10 about how to do sustainable and transient  
11 oriented design in a Historic District.

12           We would just encourage the Board to  
13 collaborate with groups like the Congress for New  
14 Urbanism and CHRS and other entities that kind of  
15 express the best thinking on these topics to come  
16 up with some design principals and kind of  
17 guidelines for this type of development in the  
18 Historic District. Thank you for your time,  
19 include my comments.

20           MS. BUELL: Thank you, that's very  
21 helpful.

22           MR. SONDERMAN: Could I ask a quick

1 question?

2 MS. BUELL: Yeah.

3 MR. SONDERMAN: Mr. Commissioner, you  
4 went down your list and I've got your comments.  
5 The building at 8<sup>th</sup> and D, you made a specific  
6 comment that it was not appropriate architecture,  
7 can you tell us why?

8 MR. PATE: Yeah, I think our major  
9 concerns on that is heavily dependent on pattern  
10 making, it was still too geometrically square,  
11 there weren't a lot of - - it was all  
12 rectilinear, there weren't a lot of curved, any  
13 curved features in that development, it still  
14 feels too modernist, almost in the brutalist  
15 fashion for our neighborhood.

16 MR. SONDERMAN: Thank you.

17 MS. BUELL: Yeah, thank you. All of the  
18 comments that we've heard today have been  
19 tremendously helpful. I think it would be helpful  
20 if we could go back to Steve and talk about a  
21 couple of things.

22 I agree that there's some risk associated

1 with breaking up the project, but it's such a  
2 large project to try to review it in one fall  
3 swoop, we would miss a number of different  
4 issues.

5           There are a number of issues that are  
6 outstanding, while we have approved some aspects  
7 of the project, the Board has made comments both  
8 based off of community concerns, ANC concerns,  
9 and Board concerns, about some of the design  
10 features, and some of the areas that still need  
11 to be studied.

12           So I think it would be helpful if we hear  
13 from you, what we've approved, what is still  
14 outstanding, and then how this is going to come  
15 into play next steps.

16           MR. WALCOTT: Okay, the majority of the  
17 comments you heard today were concerns about the  
18 overall process, but I would like to maybe start  
19 with the components of the project that we were  
20 scheduled to look at today and the comments that  
21 you heard, and just very quickly summarize the  
22 Staff recommendations on those.

1           In terms of the landscape plan; we think  
2 the landscape plan is going in exactly the right  
3 direction in which it's based very closely on the  
4 language of Capitol Hills Historic Districts the  
5 treatment of public space, both paved and planted  
6 spaces.

7           We hope that the redesign of the plaza  
8 which the last time you saw it was admittedly not  
9 designed but was shown in sort of one ground  
10 plain treatment and it felt very, very, massive,  
11 it felt very sort of paved.

12           We think the notion of extending the  
13 L'Enfant plan, street, and sidewalks through that  
14 space so that the times when it's not used as the  
15 market it will read as a relatively seamless  
16 extension of this Historic Districts public space  
17 treatment is exactly the right way to go.

18           The one recommendation we were making in  
19 terms of the treatment of the road bed, there's  
20 been discussion of cobble. I think not all of  
21 the materials have been worked out yet, but we  
22 would just encourage that whatever the treatment



1 of the ground plane of the road bed is, is that  
2 again it continue in that same vein of having  
3 some commonality of treatment with the  
4 surrounding streets. That it not be in sharp  
5 contrast in terms of coloration, material,  
6 texture, that sort of thing. It can still be a  
7 differentiated material, but not a sharply  
8 differentiated material.

9           In terms of the programming of the Plaza  
10 space for the tents, certainly heard a lot of  
11 concerns from residents, Board members, and  
12 people that are much more familiar than we are  
13 with matters related to the market. Frankly, we  
14 just don't feel like we have enough information  
15 to make a recommendation on what is the  
16 appropriate number of tents for that space. It's  
17 not specifically a preservation issue, although I  
18 certainly understand the broader point that  
19 people are making, you know about, that is an  
20 economic engine that supports the market, and the  
21 Historic District. I guess we would have to  
22 defer to the Deputy Mayor's Office, and any

1 agreement that has been made on whether or not  
2 there was any minimum number of spaces, or  
3 maximum number of tent spaces required for this  
4 project. Again we just don't have any sort of  
5 scientific background or requirements to draw on  
6 to be able to make a recommendation; this is the  
7 right number or the wrong number, both too much,  
8 and too little.

9 MR. TAYLOR: Steven, one question, tell  
10 us where we are on the number of tents, I've been  
11 hearing 60, and I count 72.

12 MR. WILCOTT: I'm going to ask the  
13 architect to give us a count, maybe Joe do you  
14 want to comment on any requirements that might  
15 have been made in this agreement?

16 MS. WEINSTEIN: I could very quickly,  
17 Joe's welcome here too. I would very quickly like  
18 to run down the little history of the number of  
19 tents. In the RFP proposal for this project I  
20 think there about 98 tents, and they stretch from  
21 7<sup>th</sup> Street all the way to 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and in fact  
22 there were a few on 7<sup>th</sup> Street itself.

1           One of the things that hasn't been  
2 brought up, because nobody really knows anything  
3 about it, is that Councilman Wells is evidently  
4 going to propose, we've heard, is going to  
5 propose legislation to manage all the markets  
6 around the Eastern Market.

7           Then there's this question, maybe it's an  
8 elephant in the room, and no one wants to talk  
9 about it, about whether or not 7<sup>th</sup> Street between  
10 C and Pennsylvania Avenue would be closed for  
11 weekend markets, like it is between C Street and  
12 North Carolina, to the north.

13           There are pros and cons in a lot of  
14 community back and forth about that idea. Our  
15 RFP proposal never proposed to have all the tents  
16 on this site. We lost tents when we had to move  
17 the parking garage entry to C Street. Originally  
18 it was right next to the truck dock entry on 7<sup>th</sup>  
19 Street, but because of transportation, and safety  
20 of pedestrians in that area, it was moved to C  
21 Street.

22           We couldn't move it to 7<sup>th</sup> Street, which

1 actually would have been a great place to have it  
2 from internal functioning because the residents,  
3 the near neighbors had told us, even before we  
4 were selected, they didn't want any vehicular  
5 entrance to this site on 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and DDOT  
6 won't let us do it off of Pennsylvania Avenue, so  
7 we put it as far east as we could, to only lose  
8 fewer tents that we could.

9           Then we also lost a few from the RFP that  
10 had been shown on 7<sup>th</sup> Street which we removed  
11 because whether 7<sup>th</sup> Street will be closed or  
12 partially closed, is totally up in the air, so  
13 that's how we came down to the current 68 tents  
14 that are shown.

15           MS. BUELL: Okay. Did you want to add  
16 anything?

17           MS. WRIGHT: Just a comment, if I could?  
18 There are 300 registered vendors that  
19 participate on the weekends. Approximately 150 on  
20 Saturday, and 150 on Sunday come and go; they are  
21 not all there at the same time.

22           But, for us to reduce to 68 tents, we

1 don't know if there will be a closed street in  
2 the future or not, and I doubt that there will be  
3 except for possibly during the construction of  
4 the project.

5 Anything speculative like that, that  
6 would be a year or 2 years from now, does not  
7 address the issue. There isn't any public space  
8 being left, other than the 68 tent spaces which  
9 are 10 by 10 size tents on the public space plan  
10 at this moment.

11 However, it has been said that there  
12 would be 90 to 120 at meeting after meeting,  
13 month after month, all this past, since the RFP.

14

15 The existing flea markets were expected  
16 to be accommodated from the get go and all the  
17 way back to the choosing of a developer. So for  
18 us to be reduced to 68 which of those small  
19 businesses will no longer be allowed to be in  
20 business a Eastern Market?

21 We know flexibility because we had to  
22 move for a temporary building to be constructed

1 after the fire, we had to move for the  
2 streetscape, we moved when the school moved. We  
3 are very flexible in keeping a market alive that  
4 supports the Eastern Market itself, all this  
5 time. But, we can't do it with 68, out of 150  
6 registered vendors.

7 MS. WEINSTEIN: May I just raise one  
8 Historic Preservation additional issue on this  
9 Plaza. When we first presented the site plan to  
10 you, don't remember what month that was, I guess  
11 April. There was a question why do we have a  
12 Plaza at all because of the L'Enfant plan and  
13 holding the street line, and we explained why we  
14 need to accommodate tents.

15 In order to get the full number of tents  
16 here I believe we would be losing the Plaza  
17 Building to get another 70 or 80 tents on this  
18 site, which would give you a very large open  
19 space there. I just want to raise that, that  
20 actually is a Historic Preservation issue  
21 perhaps, and it's a very complex problem, with  
22 lots of players, lots of concerns, lots of

1 issues.

2 MS. BUELL: That's helpful, thank you,  
3 thank you.

4 MR. WALCOTT: My question was whether  
5 there was any specific number of tents that was  
6 agreed to in any agreement with the city?

7 MR. STERNLIEB: There's not we're  
8 obligated to accommodate markets on Saturdays and  
9 Sundays from, I think, 8 to 6 p.m. as long as the  
10 community, the market manager, and the District  
11 agree, it's that it's the best use to the city to  
12 have them, no specific number.

13 MS. WRIGHT: Land use disposition  
14 document, initially there were to be 100 tents  
15 and then it just changed to the name flea market.

16 MS. BUELL: We can't go too far into some  
17 of the agreements with the Deputy Mayors but I  
18 think it's important that we at least...

19 MR. STERNLIEB: (Inaudible due to no  
20 microphone). Having said that, we're not  
21 insensitive to this issue, it comes up all the  
22 time in meetings.

1           We actually met with Carole and Mike  
2 Berman this week to see if there were things that  
3 could be done. Again, you know, they're  
4 conflicting, you know by putting trees all the  
5 way down the middle of C Street that may have an  
6 impact on the number of tents we can get onto the  
7 Plaza.

8           There are always going to be conflicts  
9 with what DDOT requires, what Historic  
10 Preservation requires, what the community wants,  
11 and we're trying to get the maximum number given,  
12 that we thought we were going to be able to have  
13 an entrance on 7<sup>th</sup> Street to the garage, DDOT  
14 rejected that.

15           The community had previously rejected an  
16 8<sup>th</sup> Street entrance and that really did have a  
17 significant impact on the number of tents that we  
18 were able to do because of that.

19           MR. TAYLOR: One last point, so 98 tents  
20 in RFP is that still a program requirement or the  
21 number of tents flexible or undefined?

22           MR. STERNLIEB: It's completely



1 undefined.

2 MR. TAYLOR: But it was stated 98 in the  
3 RFP.

4 MR. STERNLIEB: When we initially  
5 responded to the RFP we said that the plan that  
6 we were presenting could accommodate up to 98  
7 tents, subsequent to that...

8 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, your response to the  
9 RFP incorporated 98 tents, not a requirement of  
10 the RFP.

11 MR. STERNLIEB: That is correct.

12 MS. BUELL: Okay Steve.

13 MR. WILCOTT: Okay so that's the Plaza,  
14 and the public space.

15 In terms of the North and South  
16 Residential Buildings, I think that everyone's  
17 conceded that the entrances to both needs some  
18 additional work, so we won't belabor that. The  
19 only additional comment that we had about the  
20 South Residential Building or the Plaza Building,  
21 was the 7<sup>th</sup> Street elevation. The principal here  
22 that we're trying to establish is to just ensure

1 that the ground level has the best possible  
2 retail frontage that is possibly can. So that,  
3 that retail frontage is successful.

4 I think there have been some comments  
5 about lack of connectivity to Barracks Row, which  
6 I think is missing a fundamental aspect of what  
7 this project is trying to do, which is to have  
8 strong continuous retail that connects the market  
9 down 7<sup>th</sup> Street, across Pennsylvania Avenue and  
10 over to 8<sup>th</sup> Street, that is a fundamental planning  
11 principal of this project, and therefore that's  
12 why we think it's important, that 7<sup>th</sup> Street, the  
13 frontage have strong retail presence.

14 The only comment I'd make about the North  
15 Residential Building, in addition to the  
16 entrances, is that there has been discussion  
17 about the height, particularly as it faces onto  
18 8<sup>th</sup> Street it is a three story height as it faces  
19 onto 8<sup>th</sup> Street. I just want you to focus on the  
20 fourth story component it was set back 48 feet,  
21 and then I think it was 68 feet. As you saw in  
22 the perspective renderings, those are very, very

1 generous setbacks. Those fourth story masses do  
2 not in any way loom on 8<sup>th</sup> Street. I think that  
3 those were very compelling in showing that those  
4 masses are very much set back off of 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

5           We think that the redesign of the North  
6 Residential Building is very strong, much more  
7 compatible with the Historic District. I think  
8 there were some good points made about the rear  
9 elevation, that that should be continued to be  
10 looked at.

11           So those are our recommendations about  
12 the components about the project that are being  
13 discussed today.

14           We did want to respond to the ANC  
15 comments, some of the broader sort of procedural  
16 concerns that were raised. One of the first one  
17 is to get some sort of a catalog of what the  
18 staff recommendations have been, or the  
19 outstanding design issues. We're happy to  
20 prepared that in writing, and post it on the  
21 website. We will be including Board comments as  
22 well because your previous 2 motions have said,

1 to adopt the Staff report with the addition of  
2 the Board comments that have been made. The only  
3 sort of codicil to that, that I want to make is  
4 that both in the Staff reports, and in some of  
5 the Board comments you all have often made  
6 recommendations about potential solutions to  
7 problems. I just want to caution everybody that  
8 not every one of those solutions are necessary  
9 going to be the right solution.

10           You all, as we do are identifying  
11 principals that need to be addressed, such as  
12 make the building more pedestrian friendly is a  
13 principal versus what a potential solution is,  
14 such as; oh well why don't you look at the  
15 storefront design. So the write up will have  
16 both principals and solutions in it. I don't  
17 want everyone to be fixated on every possible  
18 solution, as the necessary answer.

19           Then there were, I think the ANC rightly  
20 pointed out, that in frankly our lack of time,  
21 and the Board's lack of time in being able to  
22 deliberate with as much time as you need, and I'm

1 taking up more time by babbling on now, you  
2 haven't been able to really head-on, address some  
3 of the issues that have been raised by the ANC,  
4 by the community members. Maybe now could be the  
5 time to do that.

6 One of the issues that were cited in the  
7 ANC report was the request for a reduced height  
8 or setback to the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Residential Building,  
9 which was discussed last time. The only Board  
10 comment that was made last month was that "does  
11 not need to be lower or setback, but it could be  
12 less abrupt", Maria made that comment.

13 MS. CASARELLA: I believe I did.

14 MR. WILCOTT: No other direction came  
15 from the Board accepting that recommendation from  
16 the community. So the Staff is going on the  
17 presumption that you did not direct us to direct  
18 the Applicant to setback or lower that entrance  
19 piece. So I just want to confirm that's the  
20 direction that the Board gave, was that we could  
21 look at making it less abrupt, but we were not  
22 directing the Applicants to set it back or lower

1 it in height. So that's one presumption that  
2 we're working under.

3           There was the point about needing further  
4 design work at the roofline, and the window  
5 treatment on 8<sup>th</sup> Street, again the 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
6 Residential Building. The Staff recommendation  
7 had said that, with the proposed change in the  
8 design going from the more, sort of organic,  
9 suggesting lots of different periods of row  
10 houses being developed to a more unified terrace  
11 approach, that artificially changing the  
12 rooflines in height was no longer necessary or  
13 appropriate, but that instead the design achieved  
14 that variety as the roofline through various roof  
15 treatments. So we felt that, and we heard no  
16 comments from the Board about the need to  
17 artificially change the variety of the roofline  
18 from that conceptual idea. The Staff report did  
19 recommend that there be some additional variety  
20 given to the fenestration and in the Board  
21 adopting the Staff report we're assuming that you  
22 agreed with that recommendation that we will

1 continue to work on the variety of the  
2 fenestration.

3           The 8<sup>th</sup> and D Street Building which I  
4 think you have heard a number of concerns about,  
5 and the Board has offered some comments about  
6 that specifically the Board said last month, that  
7 maybe there could be less lace work brick, that  
8 it's a little too square. The Staff  
9 recommendation was that the 8<sup>th</sup> Street frontage of  
10 that be designed to be commensurate with the D  
11 Street frontage so that it didn't feel like it  
12 was the back of the building.

13           I guess, we are seeking direction from  
14 the Board, and we also made some recommendations  
15 that we continue to look at patterning, and  
16 coloration specifically of that building, that  
17 maybe color could be a way that that building  
18 could feel a little bit more a part of the  
19 character of the Historic District.

20           Again in the Board approving the overall  
21 architectural direction last month, with these  
22 comments that additional work needed to be done,

1 we're going on the presumption that that design  
2 is generally headed in a direction that you all  
3 can support. If that's not correct...?

4 MS. CASARELLA: There were some  
5 modifications that the Board specified similar to  
6 what the ANC Commissioner pointed out.

7 MR. WILCOTT: Since that is an  
8 outstanding sticking point both in the community  
9 and apparently amongst several of the Board  
10 Members, that we certainly bring, I mean we can  
11 bring everything back to the Board, but that  
12 building in particular, it sounds like you all  
13 want to really see some serious design work, and  
14 we will bring that back to you.

15 MS. CASARELLA: It is.

16 MR. WILCOTT: Another comment from the  
17 ANC about the mechanical penthouses, there was a  
18 lot of discussion about this in April, there was  
19 a fair amount of response to that concern when  
20 half of the project was represented last month in  
21 terms of how the penthouses had been lowered,  
22 pushed back, redesigned, and the Staff had made a



1 recommendation that on the highest penthouse, on  
2 the Office Building on Pennsylvania Avenue, that  
3 the public roof deck be eliminated so that the  
4 penthouse could be further reduced in size.

5 But, other than that there were no  
6 additional comments from the Board last month  
7 about the direction of the penthouses, we didn't  
8 have any particular concerns about the penthouses  
9 on the projects and the components that are being  
10 presented to you today.

11 MS. CASARELLA: Although you may have  
12 some comments.

13 MS. CASARELLA: I believe that I did ask  
14 the owner to consider looking at geothermal  
15 systems to eliminate a lot of the equipment that  
16 would occur on the roof.

17 MS. WEINSTEIN: Yes, and we are doing  
18 that.

19 MR. WILCOTT: I will make sure that, I  
20 think we do have that in the comments.

21 Then finally the midblock courtyard, the  
22 Board has said nothing about the midblock

1 courtyard, whether it should be public or  
2 private. Therefore, you've given no direction to  
3 us to push the Applicant's one way or the other  
4 on that issue. So...

5 MR. SONDERMAN: What's the Historic  
6 Preservation component of that?

7 MR. WILCOTT: Well, and I think that,  
8 that was always sort of our question. I mean we  
9 certainly understand the desire of the community  
10 to have as much public open space as possible;  
11 it's not a traditional arrangement on Capitol  
12 Hill for inter-blocks to have public open spaces  
13 to them. Again, it's was not something that we  
14 saw as a fundamental preservation issue.  
15 However, because the Board has not addressed it,  
16 and because you've been hearing some concerns  
17 about certain elements in the community feeling  
18 like they're not being listened to, maybe we  
19 should address that head on and find out from you  
20 all whether that's something that should be  
21 pursued.

22 So, I'm going to leave it at that.

1           MS. BUELL: Okay, well good. I hope that  
2 addresses one more point which Nancy made is also  
3 adding at the end of the list of outstanding  
4 issues a clear statement that any decision by  
5 HPRB, recommendation by HPO does not impact the  
6 Zoning process and is limited to the preservation  
7 concerns, so that there is a limitation.

8           Okay, we have a number of comments, and  
9 what I'd like to do is to try to, in order to  
10 ensure that specific issues are addressed and are  
11 spoken about by the Board Members, I've broken  
12 down the ANC's recommendation into about 7 or 8  
13 different issues that I'd like to have the Board  
14 specifically address. Then we will address  
15 additional concerns that were raised by community  
16 members. So the discussion will go on for some  
17 time. I apologize for the applicants who are  
18 here for other cases that this one has run over.

19       But, I think it's important for us to take  
20 specific issues one by one, as opposed to try to  
21 generalize our comments.

22           So what we're going to do is we're going

1 to start with general landscaping comment made by  
2 the ANC. The attention to the width of the  
3 stone, and also the water features and whether or  
4 not there needs to be additional consideration to  
5 the elevation of the water features.

6 So what we'll do is we'll start with Bob.

7 If you have any specific comments about the  
8 landscape plan, and please note that this is a  
9 separate issue from the C Street Plaza which  
10 we'll address next.

11 MR. SONDERMAN: I don't have any specific  
12 comments about the landscape plan other than my  
13 own role as a National Parks Service employee and  
14 my growing enafma(ph sp) towards water features  
15 in general. Every time they put a new water  
16 feature in the design is such, that it's supposed  
17 to be compatible year round, you look at WWII  
18 Memorial, go to WWII Memorial in the middle of  
19 December, it's not the same Memorial you see in  
20 June.

21 If there is going to be water features,  
22 they have to work, not necessarily water, they

1 have to do something in the winter, and in the  
2 spring and summer.

3 That would be my primary comment about  
4 that.

5 MS. BUELL: Maria?

6 MS. CASARELLA: Regarding the C Street  
7 materials. I think you should consider  
8 continuing the change in materials, all  
9 throughout C Street rather than stopping at the  
10 parking entry. I think it's just, it would  
11 benefit the design and the overall character of  
12 the Street to have that continuous rather than  
13 kind of celebrate the parking entrance.

14 The water features, I agree with Bob and  
15 I'm sure there's a creative solution to make them  
16 look wonderful during the winter, even when  
17 they're not bubbling.

18 I think a broader consideration since  
19 there is so much building area, and so much  
20 landscape that's going to be incorporated, is  
21 what are the sustainable strategies in terms of  
22 water collection on the site, reuse of water? I

1 think you really need to address that. We're  
2 interested in hearing about it.

3 MS. DELPLACE: And we have developed a  
4 strategy, and we certainly can present that to  
5 you.

6 MS. CASARELLA: Yeah, I think it's  
7 integral with the design of the project and we'd  
8 like to know about.

9 MS. DELPLACE: Okay.

10 MS. CASARELLA: Those are all my comments  
11 about the landscape.

12 MR. BUELL: Okay. Joseph?

13 MR. TAYLOR: I agree that the C Street  
14 service should go from 7<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup>. I think the  
15 water features should be eliminated and leave the  
16 Plaza space for pedestrian use. I think they may  
17 have impact of being more than obstacle versus  
18 something that's, it's not delineated as a focal  
19 point, so I see it as an element that contributes  
20 to the weakness of the Plaza.

21 The big idea that I'm seeing, as I'm  
22 looking at the overall site plan, and hearing

1 comments, and this goes to the architect, and to  
2 Amy or the developers. Has there been any  
3 consideration connecting the Plaza, and the  
4 courtyard, and having the Plaza be, when it's in  
5 the weekend mode, when the flea market is in  
6 place, that the flea market area includes the  
7 Plaza, and the courtyard?

8 MS. WEINSTEIN: Yes we looked at that  
9 early on. I think I'd like to say a little  
10 something about this courtyard here. It's about  
11 64 feet wide here, across it. There are  
12 apartments on the ground floor, all the way up to  
13 the top on all sides except where the office  
14 building is, and then there are office windows  
15 there. These apartments those are their only  
16 windows, they're not through units with windows  
17 on the street, and to put a flea market in there,  
18 in a way would be akin to trying to put it up  
19 here on the site, in these people's backyards,  
20 except those aren't their front windows even.  
21 That the noise of a flea market, that kind of  
22 public activity when there are ground floor units

1 right here, does not seem to work, to be feasible  
2 in my mind. And that's really why this courtyard  
3 has been made a private courtyard. We see it as  
4 the rear yard garden for the units, all the units  
5 that are there.

6 MR. TAYLOR: Okay, I'm okay with it being  
7 shot down; I just wanted to bring it up. All  
8 right those are my comments. Thank you.

9 MS. BACON: A couple of additional  
10 questions and comments. One I agree about u sing  
11 the same materials on C Street through, and part  
12 of the reason that I would recommend that, is  
13 that it then would read as a pedestrian area,  
14 rather than a vehicular area, let's go racing in  
15 around the corner into the garage. Instead it  
16 would be, you know, this is a pedestrian area  
17 where people are going to be walking, and I have  
18 to be cautious and careful of it.

19 The other thing is with regard to the  
20 water features. I wonder if there's any way they  
21 could be flat, there are such wonderful water  
22 features throughout the country, where they just



1 shoot up, and perhaps could they be used for  
2 tents when they're not actually being used. I  
3 thought maybe there could be a, you know a mutual  
4 use of the space in some different way.

5           Also, I wondered about the courtyard,  
6 whether there are any specifications in the RFP  
7 as to whether this would be a public space or a  
8 private space, because it seems to be an issue  
9 that the community has raised, and there was  
10 somehow and assumption that, on the part of some  
11 people that it would be public.

12           MS. WEINSTEIN: I've read the LDDA; I've  
13 not seen anything that would require being  
14 public.

15           MR. STERNLIEB: There's no public  
16 requirement for the courtyard.

17           MS. BACON: Was that presented by your  
18 team as something you would be kind of giving  
19 back to the community when you were presenting  
20 during the whole RFP process.

21           MR. STERNLIEB: There are so many  
22 iterations of this. In the very first iteration

1 we had the Tiger Woods Foundation was going to  
2 build a school back there, and there was going to  
3 be a playground over a sunken courtyard for the  
4 Shakespeare Theater, both Tiger Woods, for  
5 personal reasons and the Shakespeare Theater for  
6 financial reasons decided not to pursue those  
7 particular ideas, and we reconfigured it so that  
8 we could, we needed to do something with that  
9 space in the Residential Building, that's when it  
10 became residential, and that's when we had to  
11 make the decision that it really didn't make any  
12 sense to make it a public space.

13 MS. BACON: Then I do not believe there  
14 was any way for the public to walk directly from  
15 a public way into that, only through the school  
16 or through the Shakespeare...

17 MR. STERNLIEB: In some ways the current  
18 configuration now, at least allows, for those  
19 people who would need to, for instance if during  
20 flea market times if it's difficult to get access  
21 from the Plaza or from 7<sup>th</sup> Street into the Plaza  
22 Building, there's a possibility now which didn't

1 exist previously to come through the lobby, and  
2 the green on the Pennsylvania Avenue side through  
3 the courtyard to access that building.

4 MR. PATE: So if I might give the  
5 community, and some of the ANC Commissioners  
6 perspective, I'm speaking only as myself right  
7 now. But the RFP presented the courtyard as a  
8 place where Shakespeare performances would be  
9 occurring.

10 The plans in February presented the  
11 courtyard as open on both ends, most like  
12 Gessford Court, or Sladen's Way, so I would rebut  
13 the argument that there are no interior courtyard  
14 spaces, like spaces on Capitol Hill, there are  
15 plenty. Then one end was closed off, in the next  
16 iteration of the plans, and then the last  
17 iteration of the plans, completely closed off.  
18 That's the evolution of the interior courtyard  
19 space.

20 MS. WEINSTEIN: I would like to just  
21 comment on the first part of that, the rest of  
22 that is correct. The Shakespeare performances

1    were being done on the C Street Plaza, never  
2    inside the private courtyard, and we had a  
3    diagram that showed how that would work.

4           MR. STERNLIEB:  There was rehearsal, open  
5    rehearsal space but it wasn't something that you  
6    could actually view in the courtyard originally.

7           MS. WEINSTEIN:  It was for Private  
8    Shakespeare rehearsal space.

9           MR. PATE:  Okay.

10          MR. STERNLIEB:  Then the performance was  
11    supposed to be on the Plaza, and still  
12    potentially could be.

13          MS. BUELL:  Pam?

14          MS. SCOTT:  I agree with my colleagues  
15    about carrying over the C Street paving pattern,  
16    and I'm very much in favor of the water features  
17    and like the fact that they're broken up into 3  
18    parts that are different sizes, and I think  
19    they're going to add a great deal to this entire  
20    plaza experience.

21                 In terms of the some of the community  
22    comments that have been made about the

1 landscaping, and that this project is not giving  
2 back to the community what the community  
3 expected. I would say that the landscape  
4 treatment of the 8<sup>th</sup> Street façade, residential  
5 pieces is responding very closely to not only  
6 what is across the street on 8<sup>th</sup> Street but to the  
7 normal Capitol Hill and Washington City response  
8 of row houses being setback with private yards in  
9 front.

10 I think that the courtyard should be  
11 enclosed as a private space, it is the tradition  
12 on Capitol Hill as well as most of the other  
13 parts of the city that row houses have a public  
14 aspect at the front of the house, but they have  
15 private gardens in the rear, and this courtyard  
16 as it now is configured would give to the  
17 residents the same kind of amenity of privacy  
18 that the people on the other side of 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
19 and elsewhere have their own private gardens. We  
20 wouldn't expect the people on the east side of 8<sup>th</sup>  
21 Street to give up their private gardens for  
22 public space.

1           The other comments that I have, have to  
2 do with vendors and with general land use, and I  
3 don't know if it's feasible or if it's every been  
4 considered that the very barren Metro Plaza, and  
5 I lived in this neighborhood for 15 years, and  
6 always that very large plaza from 7<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
7 is just a blight on the landscape and it would be  
8 a very enlivening experience to have the vendors  
9 broken up between the 2 sides of Pennsylvania  
10 Avenue.

11           MS. WEINSTEIN: Now that that particular  
12 parcel is no longer controlled by the National  
13 Park Service, there is legally a possibility for  
14 that to happen. Again, it's beyond the scope of  
15 this project.

16           MS. SCOTT: Fabulous.

17           MS. BUELL: Yes, please.

18           MR. FISHBERG: Just to respond to a  
19 couple of those concerns, it's certainly from the  
20 ANC perspective, if you heard us say we had a  
21 problem with the landscaping in 8<sup>th</sup> Street, then  
22 maybe that was misheard, but we don't. I'm not

1 sure if I fully understand your concern as a  
2 reflection of community concerns.

3           As to the private garden aspect of this,  
4 that's a comment that's come up, but these are  
5 condos and apartment buildings, your compared to  
6 townhomes that have a private garden in the rear  
7 and that's I think a different circumstance. If  
8 you go down to other apartment buildings, I mean  
9 there's limited courtyards that are available to  
10 them in some place, but they're not private  
11 gardens and the 2 are not comparable even though  
12 there's some common spaces usually commensurate  
13 with an apartment or a condo.

14           I will point out on the roof of this  
15 building, there is space that's available, and  
16 there is a swimming pool that is private and just  
17 for the use of the residences. There's space  
18 that could be used for receptions or parties as  
19 far as I could tell from looking at that,  
20 sunbathing, I mean there really is private space  
21 that's accommodated on the roof there. So I do  
22 think that is addressed in the plans and is not

1 a sort of by right, or a requirement of the kind  
2 of backyard, kind of by right if we're in an  
3 apartment or a condo building that somehow comes  
4 with this space.

5 MS. SCOTT: I was responding to comments  
6 by people other than the general public that  
7 spoke today who felt that we were not responding  
8 to their comments.

9 I will say that I think that what Amy  
10 said about the fact that the apartments that are  
11 around that courtyard with ground level units,  
12 and even with second story units, are owed a  
13 respect in terms of a privacy aspect.

14 MR. FISHBERG: The official position of  
15 the ANC with respect to the courtyard and I think  
16 Brian's characterization of it, its evolution is  
17 correct, which lead to some of the concern, it's  
18 sort of semi-public, then closed as one end, and  
19 closed at both ends.

20 Our official position on this has been  
21 that we support a public courtyard. If it needs  
22 to be private then we would be looking for



1 opportunities to either raise the level or to  
2 shrink it in other ways, such that it can  
3 accommodate some of the other concerns that we  
4 have, vis-a-vis height and massing.

5           In our best circumstance I think there's  
6 an agreement, or letter of intent, to have a  
7 supermarket be a part of the facility. I don't  
8 think there is a resident around there that would  
9 need large amounts of retail street space. A  
10 supermarket is the kind of retail development  
11 that we want? And you can use that interior space  
12 for supermarkets, and that sort of stuff.

13           I think that by raising the level, I mean  
14 the Harris Teeter that's just a few blocks away  
15 has no exterior space to it. Our objective would  
16 be to find other uses, and if it needs to be  
17 private to kind of reduce the space a little bit  
18 to accomplish some of the other needs of the  
19 project, some of which have been made in the  
20 context of the HP process.

21           MS. WEINSTEIN: Ivan if I could just  
22 clarify that thought as I've grown to understand,

1 the ideas that the mass above grade would be  
2 reduced by the amount of windowless space  
3 achieved by raising the courtyard up, adding  
4 space inside the courtyard.

5 MR. FISHBERG: Yeah, so for example on  
6 our 8<sup>th</sup> Streets concerns around the entrance  
7 building. If we're asking you to take away a  
8 little bit from the front either by setting it  
9 back or lowering the height, we understand that  
10 you could try to accomplish something.

11 MS. WEINSTEIN: It would be windowless  
12 and we would then lose the residents on the  
13 ground floor.

14 MS. BUELL: Okay. I agree with the ANC's  
15 recommendation that more attention needs to be  
16 paid to the widths of the stone.

17 My concern about the water features is  
18 actually not so much about the water features in  
19 particular, but it has more to do with the use of  
20 the Plaza as a public space.

21 One of the things that we have done  
22 before, as a board, that I propose Staff work

1 with Applicants, the ANC, and the community  
2 members, is to try to set up a meeting, because I  
3 don't think we have enough information about the  
4 public, private space question, there some  
5 disagreement or additional information needed  
6 about the specific preservation concern.

7           Maybe we can host a meeting whether it's  
8 with DDOT to further discuss both the size of the  
9 Plaza because there's a number of questions that  
10 remain about what's promised, and what's not, and  
11 also the use of the public space with the hope  
12 that this conversation can continue. I'm not  
13 sure that the Board is in the position to require  
14 that the interior area be public space or private  
15 space. Maybe that's something that we can help  
16 to facilitate the conversation without  
17 necessarily making a firm decision about the use  
18 of the space of the interior courtyard.

19           MS. CASARELLA: Why are we considering  
20 the interior courtyard as a preservation issue?

21           MS. BUELL: There's some disagreement  
22 about whether or not that interior space as it

1 relates to the open plaza and whether or not  
2 traditionally those interior plazas would be used  
3 as public space or private space.

4           So while the preservation concern may not  
5 be as prominent as it typically is, I think the  
6 conversation still needs to be had so at least  
7 this issue can be flushed out, and we have some  
8 sense that the community is comfortable with the  
9 amount of space allocated to the plaza, and also  
10 to the interior courtyard.

11           MR. SONDERMAN: Catherine, I think this  
12 may be a real simple yes, no. Is the courtyard  
13 public space, or private space?

14           MR. STARNLIEB: You asking me a legal  
15 question?

16           MR. SONDERMAN: No I'm asking you a  
17 simple question, is the courtyard private...

18           MR. STERNLIEB: Private space.

19           MR. SONDERMAN: End of discussion.

20           MS. BUELL: Okay, okay. As we move  
21 forward we can continue to consider whether or  
22 not an additional meeting will be needed. What

1 I'm hearing from my colleagues, is that in terms  
2 of how the Board is perceiving it is that it is  
3 private space, and there's not a preservation  
4 concern for the interior plaza.

5           Okay, we'll move on to the C Street  
6 Plaza. Whether the layout of the market is  
7 appropriate, both in terms of the landscape which  
8 we did, in part, just discuss. Also whether the  
9 size of the market, the layout I think now we  
10 have a lot more information so it raises a number  
11 of additional questions.

12           So we will start with Pam.

13           MS. SCOTT: I very much like the whole  
14 configuration of this plaza and its relationship  
15 to the North Residential, and the Plaza  
16 Residential elements. I feel that in fact  
17 there's more public space here than you would  
18 normally have in any comparable kind of  
19 development on the city.

20           We are here at a nexus point along 8<sup>th</sup>  
21 Street where the division between the commercial  
22 part of Capitol Hill and then at least along

1 Pennsylvania Avenue, and then the totally  
2 residential part on the other side of the street.

3           It's in keeping with the open space  
4 around Eastern Market itself, and the north  
5 markets around it, and the public pool and so  
6 forth on the north side.

7           I like very much the canted angle, and I  
8 think it will create a very nice and very  
9 comfortable public space for a large number of  
10 people.

11           I wondered about the Bollards, whether it  
12 would be possible if they were retractable  
13 whether it would then add the possibility of more  
14 vendor space along there or not only in that case  
15 but retractable so that movement of people across  
16 would be more feasible.

17           MS. DELPLACE: Just to answer that, the  
18 Bollards and the trees have been spaced to  
19 actually work with the tent spacing to get the  
20 maximum number. So even if we removed the  
21 bollards we wouldn't be able to add more tents  
22 realistically because we'd still need to maintain

1 the walkway in front of the north residence, and  
2 then the double loaded tents, and then the  
3 emergency required 12 foot access.

4 I think the way that we approached this  
5 was that we started to maximize, tried to  
6 maximize the number of tents, and then used the  
7 bollard placement, and the tree placement to  
8 actually support the maximum number of tents and  
9 the layout.

10 MS. SCOTT: Why are their bollards, when  
11 we see bollards in the rest of the city now what  
12 it denotes is a security measure?

13 MS. DELPLACE: There are bollards because  
14 we have a flush curb and you'd be required to  
15 have a bollard, and that's why we sought for a  
16 historic reference so that we went to the  
17 reservations to find something that wouldn't kind  
18 of denote a security issue. But you would be  
19 required either to have a 6 inch high curb or a  
20 bollard.

21 MS. SCOTT: You would not have a chain  
22 between the bollards?

1           MR. STERNLIEB: In response to the second  
2 part of your question we are exploring removable  
3 bollards so that if you wanted to open it up for  
4 any purpose you might be able to pull them up and  
5 put them back. We've seen a couple of examples  
6 of that, and we just haven't figured out if it  
7 would work in this case.

8           MS. CASARELLA: The spacing of the  
9 bollards, is that a requirement?

10          MS. DELPLACE: The spacing of the  
11 bollards is required to be 5 feet on center, so  
12 what we've done, obviously the tents are 10 feet,  
13 so we worked with that spacing as well to  
14 maximize the amount of exposure that we can have  
15 between the bollards and the tents, and trees.

16          MS. BUELL: Okay. Elinor?

17          MS. BACON: Still the same question as to  
18 whether you could have the water elements flush  
19 with the sidewalks, maybe you could put whole  
20 other row. I really like the Plaza too; I think  
21 it's great, lovely. But I am also hearing in my  
22 community that people really, really, love that



1 flea market, and it is significantly reduced over  
2 what they currently have. I don't think you want  
3 a wide open Plaza so that it can be just for flea  
4 market use; you've got to accommodate all sorts  
5 of uses.

6           If there would be anyway that you could  
7 increase the number of tents I think that would  
8 be great.

9           MS. DELPLACE: And we have looked at  
10 that, the problem is after the second row of  
11 tents we'd also have to have another 12 feet  
12 emergency access, yes, on the sidewalk so you  
13 have to have emergency access between the tents  
14 after every double row. Then it would push it up  
15 to the façade of the building. But, we've heard  
16 what you've said and we're going to try and look  
17 at this again to see if we can maximize the  
18 tents.

19           MR. TAYLOR: I like the Plaza; I still  
20 have a problem with a raised water feature. I  
21 agree with Elinor if you could let the water  
22 feature exist, not as a pond but as something

1 that has drama and excitement, and the occurrence  
2 of when it shoots up and when it's dormant. So  
3 that the Plaza space surface is more dominant and  
4 the water feature subordinate to that.

5           It's a great space, the south edge as it  
6 meets 7<sup>th</sup> Street sets it up for what may happen  
7 on 7<sup>th</sup> Street from a legislative standpoint but if  
8 that doesn't happen I think it will work very  
9 well when it's built up. Thank you.

10           MS. BUELL: Maria?

11           MS. CASARELLA: I have nothing further to  
12 add.

13           MS. BUELL: I am actually highly  
14 uncomfortable with the reduction in the Plaza  
15 space, and the number of tents. My  
16 uncomfortableness comes from somebody who  
17 regularly visits the market.

18           It is not fully a preservation concern,  
19 although I think that one of the prize features  
20 of the development is the Plaza space, and the  
21 use of space by community members. Because of  
22 that reason I would strongly support, and I ask

1 Steve if the Historic Preservation Office can  
2 host a meeting to continue to have this  
3 conversation?

4           It sounds like there are a number of  
5 different approaches. It may not be expanding  
6 the Plaza space, but there are a number of ways  
7 that whether the developer works with the city,  
8 other city agencies to make sure that the number  
9 of tents, and the amount of plaza space, that the  
10 outdoor market is not significantly reduced in  
11 size.

12           Now that we've seen it, one of my first  
13 reactions to the plans was; oh my gosh, this is  
14 much smaller, not that we've seen how it's  
15 actually planned out.

16           I would prefer if the Board would hold  
17 off specifically on making a decision in terms of  
18 the plans for the plaza space until this  
19 conversation is had, just till the meeting is  
20 hosted.

21           One of the things we've heard from many  
22 of the community members is that there's some

1 feeling that some of their concerns are not  
2 addressed, in large part because we're the  
3 Preservation Review Board, and there are a number  
4 of issues we can't address, they're outside our  
5 jurisdiction and we're not going to attempt to  
6 address them today.

7 At least we can make sure that the  
8 conversation is had and that there is some  
9 comfortableness with the community, with the  
10 business community, and with the ANC, that there  
11 has been some resolution.

12 Amy I appreciate the fact that you've  
13 been very thoughtful about how to approach the  
14 issue, but the large conversation just has to be  
15 had.

16 MR. SONDERMAN: I have a comment  
17 Catherine.

18 MS. BUELL: Yes.

19 MR. SONDERMAN: I have no problem with  
20 relooking at this, but I will stand firm in my  
21 previous statement that the courtyard size is not  
22 a preservation issue, and the use of that

1 courtyard is not a preservation issue. As much  
2 as I'm there every day, not every day maybe every  
3 other third day and I'm there on the weekends, I  
4 enjoy the hell out of the free market. It's a  
5 wonderful amenity to the community, it's  
6 fabulous, but I have to separate my personal  
7 desire to have maybe 160 vendors versus what is  
8 to me clearly not a preservation issue.

9           If we can split the hairs I would  
10 certainly support adding more space. I think it  
11 shocked me when I saw that it went down, or  
12 seemingly went down. Even though there's not a  
13 compelling legal reason for us to provide any  
14 space at all it's a design function, it's a  
15 Historic Preservation Function the way these  
16 buildings are laid out. It's not the use of the  
17 plaza that we can get ourselves involved in,  
18 specifically. If we can get more, that's great,  
19 and I'll just leave it at that.

20           MS. BACON: Could I just add one thing, I  
21 would urge that DMPED be involved in this,  
22 because, I mean, this really is an issue and I

1 keep feeling this throughout the discussion that  
2 they're Historic Preservation Issues but there  
3 are an awful lot of issues that are fundamental  
4 to the community that we're trying to deal with  
5 that really aren't our issues.

6 I think a meeting that would engage DMPED  
7 with us, and as you were saying Department of  
8 Transportation would be a really good thing.

9 MS. BUELL: We've done this before,  
10 particularly in case such as the Hilton Hotel  
11 where there were a number of concerns about the  
12 parking garage, transportation concerns, the  
13 Preservation Board did reserve it's decision  
14 until a meeting was held with DDOT to address  
15 concerns outside of our jurisdiction, and I don't  
16 see any reason why we can't do so in this case.

17 MR. WALCOTT: Yeah. I actually want to  
18 echo Elinor's comment. I think this is primarily  
19 a DMPED issue, I don't think it's primarily  
20 preservation issue.

21 MS. BUELL: Agreed.

22 MR. WALCOTT: They are our sister agency,

1 and so we will certainly convey the concerns that  
2 we're hearing both from the community and from  
3 the Board about the desire to look at additional  
4 tent spaces.

5 I don't know exactly what position other  
6 than the Board wants more tents, or potentially  
7 wants more tents, to take at such a meeting. So  
8 I think we need to go back to DMPED and say DMPED  
9 you need to convene a meeting on this issue, of  
10 which we will certainly participate, DDOT will  
11 certainly participate, and have them look at  
12 global ways, and maybe it's things like the Metro  
13 Plaza that this issue could be resolved.

14 MS. BUELL: That's fine, and I hear from  
15 my colleagues that the concern is not necessarily  
16 about this specific design, whether the current  
17 plaza plans stay in place as presented to the  
18 Board today, the conversation still needs to be  
19 had before we finalize our decision.

20 It's quite possible that additional tent  
21 space may be off site, and may have no impact on  
22 the current plans.

1           What we've heard from all of the Board  
2 Members, a number of the Board Members, is that  
3 there is not a major preservation concern in  
4 terms of the number of tents, but there is a  
5 concern that this issue is still outstanding with  
6 the community in particular.

7           My concern is that the Board should not  
8 make a decision either way, recognizing that  
9 there are no specific design concerns before the  
10 conversation is had.

11           MR. STERNLIEB: Could I ask a question  
12 about that?

13           We anticipated, you know, we get copied  
14 on a lot of the correspondence so we anticipated  
15 that this would come up. Internally we've really  
16 tried to focus our attention dealing before this  
17 Board with things that were specifically within  
18 the jurisdiction of this Board so we didn't have  
19 to go back and back and back after we dealt with  
20 one set of issues.

21           My concern about leaving it as an open  
22 issue before this Board is that if we can get



1 through the DMPED process with the Zoning  
2 Commission, with the community relatively  
3 satisfied, and then we come back here and it's  
4 still an open issue.

5           You're making a decision to overturn  
6 something that was decided by the people for whom  
7 it is the proper jurisdiction. It's a little bit  
8 of a concern to us. I'm very appreciative of the  
9 comments that were made, and I think that we'd be  
10 more than happy to participate in a community  
11 process led by DMPED.

12           In addition to DDOT you're going to have  
13 the fire department there, the Office of Planning  
14 will be there, Tommy Wells office will be there.

15       There are a lot of people for whom this is a  
16 major issue, and what it guess, respectfully  
17 request, is that we're not required to come back  
18 and have Historic Preservation weigh in again  
19 after we go through that piece of the process.

20           MS. BUELL: So hearing that concern I'm  
21 willing to defer given that the Board has made it  
22 clear that there is not a major preservation

1 concern in terms of the design, to the Staff to  
2 make sure that the issue is resolved so that you  
3 don't have to come back before that Board. It is  
4 important that the meeting with all the various  
5 parties be had.

6 MR. FISHBERG: Sorry, I didn't mean to  
7 interrupt but before you kind of close off where  
8 you're going with this, I do want to, I like the  
9 way you present this in terms of not closing off  
10 discussion or giving approval on this and keeping  
11 it open, and our concern is, and we understand  
12 there's this sort of - - there are issues that  
13 are clearly in the PUD process and are clearly HP  
14 issues, and there are some that kind of cross  
15 over.

16 I don't know what the HP issues are about  
17 water fountains and whether they're 2 feet off  
18 the ground, or they're sunk in, or what they look  
19 like in the winter, I don't know what the HP  
20 guidance is on that.

21 So you asked that question but then you  
22 also say, is this an historic issue. There are

1 some gray areas here, for the community we have a  
2 history, a human history here, which again is not  
3 really reflected in a lot of what comes before  
4 the Board maybe or what's discussed here.

5 We have a history of a school, 150 years,  
6 and educational history, there's a people history  
7 here in terms of the market, and the vibrancy.

8 We have a growing population; you're  
9 going to add thousands of people to this site.  
10 We have an area that we're just going through  
11 redistricting now that may end up being part of  
12 our commission, that's going to grow again by  
13 thousands of people that are going to populate  
14 this area and see it as part of part of their,  
15 kind of, central core of their community. How we  
16 accommodate those people and how we accommodate  
17 that commercial core, that is really critical  
18 stuff that I think does reflect on the history,  
19 way more in fact than a lintel, or the height of  
20 a water fountain.

21 So our concern with sort of closing off  
22 and saying hey from an HP perspective the Board

1 has said the site plan is fine including the  
2 Plaza. Where we end up with the PUD process is  
3 they don't, our understanding of it, like to  
4 disagree with another city agency. So they are  
5 somewhat then constrained to be able to say well  
6 we actually think there should be a different  
7 site plan here.

8           So I think the, and we as we concluded  
9 our sort of HP hearing with our fifth special  
10 called meeting we asked the PUD folks to come in  
11 and give us a hearing and had some conversation  
12 with them about this. The noted is not without  
13 exception but there is a sense that the city does  
14 not like to disagree with itself.

15           So, in the affirmative position, that the  
16 site plan is all good and fine, with you all, and  
17 maybe constraining in that process, I think,  
18 while we continue these conversations, and  
19 continue to try and work it out, let's not tilt  
20 the deck in any one particular direction.

21           MR. STERNLIEB: I not suggesting that HP  
22 functions are not a part of this process. Really

1 what I'm suggesting is that we create a process  
2 that does function and if for instance, you know  
3 in a hypothetical, if the Board were to have  
4 taken a very different response to this and say,  
5 you know they actually didn't care at all about  
6 the market but they only want to plant trees  
7 everywhere so you couldn't have any tents and  
8 that was their decision.

9 I think that the community would go to  
10 the Zoning Commission and attempt to say, you  
11 know, that doesn't work for this particular  
12 place, and we'd like you to actually overturn  
13 that. At that point I wouldn't want to have to  
14 come back again to this Board for them to  
15 overturn it again, you create an endless loop,  
16 and that's really my concern.

17 I think that the Chairman really put it  
18 well to ask the Staff to pull it together with  
19 DMPAD, have you, and us, and everybody in the  
20 room and to be mindful of the comments that have  
21 been made, and to represent the Historic  
22 Preservation Boards comments that they'd like to

1 see us get more tents for a market...

2 MS. WEINSTEIN: What I'm hearing here  
3 perhaps is that we enter into this process as  
4 suggested, great idea. If that process results  
5 in the same number of tents we currently have on  
6 this site because others are found elsewhere,  
7 that the Board is okay with this Plaza as  
8 designed. If however a change has to be made, a  
9 change would be made and it would come back to  
10 the Board.

11 MS. BUELL: Correct. Specifically  
12 speaking to the ANC's concern that this is an  
13 open market area and there has to be a way that  
14 we can still accomplish that open market area  
15 feel.

16 MR. STERNLIEB: We still haven't had the  
17 fire department sign off on all of this yet, and  
18 we're hopeful that we're not going to be pulled  
19 back more.

20 I think we went from 92 tents to 68 just  
21 because of DDOT's decision not to allow us to use  
22 the 7<sup>th</sup> Street access for the parking garage; it

1 was a major hit to the market.

2 MS. BUELL: Yeah, and we appreciate that.

3 We know it's a complicated conversation but it  
4 needs to be had.

5 Okay so we'll move on to the Plaza  
6 Building. The ANC raised a concern about the 7<sup>th</sup>  
7 and C Street in the symmetry of the window  
8 placement, and the window treatments, am I  
9 characterizing that correctly?

10 MR. FISHBERG: At the 7<sup>th</sup> Street end. We  
11 had a long conversation about this, it was quite  
12 illustrative. There is a somewhat chaotic order  
13 to the entire façade of that building, which I  
14 think is by design. At the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
15 end it starts to change or fall to pieces in our  
16 mind a little bit and become a little bit  
17 confused.

18 You notice the lintel's at the top are  
19 equal in their spacing but kind of off set to one  
20 end of the building. There was a sense that it  
21 got a little bit confused at the 7<sup>th</sup> Street end.

22 MS. BUELL: Okay, we'll open it up for

1 Board comment and we'll start with Bob.

2 MR. SONDERMAN: I think at this stage I'm  
3 going to support the Staff report.

4 MS. CASARELLA: Well I have a different  
5 point of view.

6 I feel like the Plaza Building has a job  
7 of making a pretty strong transition from the  
8 Pennsylvania Avenue density mass, to the  
9 residential scale. Right now I don't think the  
10 design is successfully doing that, with the five  
11 stories, and looking at the prospective that you  
12 had shown us, and looking at the elevation seems  
13 too tall to me.

14 I'd like you to consider, perhaps making  
15 it four stories, and making the bays shorter,  
16 maybe two story bays, not three story bays.

17 I appreciate all the examples that you're  
18 looking at, you're really studying precedents  
19 that are local, and they're fascinating. Right  
20 now the design seems to be going in two different  
21 directions based on the 7<sup>th</sup> Street elevation and  
22 the Plaza elevation. They have the bay treatment



1 versus the sort of more open character of the  
2 Plaza elevation. I would encourage you to make  
3 that more consistent around the corner so that it  
4 reads as one building. Does that sound clear?

5           The eyebrow windows, or the arched  
6 windows, or rather the arches, the masonry detail  
7 seems a little inconsistent again, with the  
8 overall language of the Trabeated system. I  
9 don't think it's really adding anything to the  
10 design.

11           The entry again is really competing with  
12 the entry of the garage entry, they seems to,  
13 again not - - I know we reviewed the garage entry  
14 but to me there's a real disconnect having the  
15 entry to that building sort of pushed in the  
16 corner there up against the garage entry. I  
17 don't know if you can consider relocating it but  
18 again I think that needs a lot more though.

19           The store fronts, I'm not sure I  
20 understand on the Plaza side how those store  
21 fronts are going to work now, it's very  
22 abstracted, there's just sort of glass under the

1 bay, I'm sure you will have more detail on that.

2 It was extremely helpful, by the way, to have  
3 the 3 dimensional views of the bay and all the  
4 shadow and depth, I think that really informed to  
5 the design when I saw that. Those are my  
6 comments on the Plaza Building.

7 MS. BUELL: Okay, thank you. Joseph?

8 MR. TAYLOR: We're not there yet, I think  
9 we have elevations that are less than delightful.  
10 The amount of glazing, the spandrel conditions  
11 between the glazings, from floor to floor that's  
12 very thin and not working well.

13 MS. WEINSTEIN: Which building Mr. Taylor?

14 MS. BUELL: We're talking about the Plaza  
15 Building.

16 MS. WEINSTEIN: Okay, the spandrel?

17 MR. TAYLOR: I'm looking at the C Street  
18 elevation and it carries over on the 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
19 elevation, it's the fenestrations and the height  
20 of the glazing from one story to the other were  
21 less than successful with how we transition from  
22 one floor to the other, and perhaps there's some

1 meaning behind the thinness of the spandrel but  
2 that tells me that we aren't there with  
3 fenestration and material between glazing  
4 openings. That's what jumps out at me, beyond  
5 what Maria had to say, needs some more study.

6 We could have a long discussion but it  
7 comes down to window openings and the amount of  
8 material that's not glazing, and the better  
9 balance between the two.

10 MS. BUELL: Okay, Elinor.

11 MS. BACON: I liked your whole discussion  
12 about using, looking back to the late Victorian  
13 era rather than some of the other eras, I really  
14 liked that and what you had done to the building,  
15 I like the change in colors, I think that's very  
16 exciting.

17 I just, I think you actually used that  
18 word chaotic, and certainly you did as well.  
19 This section here for me just doesn't work, and  
20 maybe I'm miss reading it when I'm looking at it  
21 and what you showed on the screen but is it kind  
22 of like going like this? I would just love it to

1 be more pure late Victorian without what seems to  
2 me an addition which doesn't enhance the  
3 building, but that's, you know, it's personalized  
4 design.

5 MS. BUELL: Okay. Pam?

6 MS. SCOTT: In relationship to the  
7 comments about the large size of the windows on  
8 the C Street elevation, this is the only light  
9 source for those apartments because they don't go  
10 through, I think a large amount of light is  
11 necessary in these small spaces.

12 In terms of the chaotic or confused  
13 aspect, this to me, it's complex without being  
14 out of control and verging onto chaos, and that  
15 in fact complexity is very much a desirable  
16 element within this context.

17 We have one of the city's finest  
18 architects who has many signature buildings on  
19 Capitol Hill, and too in the process that we've  
20 been going through in the meetings some of her  
21 signature elements are lost, and I think that her  
22 reduction of these designs has retained her own

1 quality architecture, very admirable, without  
2 losing the individuality of it.

3 MS. BUELL: Thank you. So as you see  
4 there's a little bit of a difference of opinion.  
5 I also have a little bit of a different opinion.  
6 I like the eyebrows; I think it adds some  
7 context. I agree with Pam I think the front  
8 façade of the Plaza Building, it's complex  
9 without being overdone.

10 I do have a question which was raised by  
11 some of the community members about the size of  
12 the balconies. Are these very side balconies?

13 MS. WEINSTEIN: No they're 6 feet wide and  
14 they project out, I think only 3 feet or 2 foot  
15 8, they're very small.

16 MS. BUELL: Just something that somebody  
17 can stand at, you're not going to have a lot of  
18 furniture and other - - okay.

19 MS. WEINSTEIN: You would not be able to  
20 walk out onto it if you had anything on it.

21 MS. BUELL: Okay. Maria raised the  
22 question as to whether or not the projections on

1 the 7<sup>th</sup> Street side should be reduced to 3  
2 stories. My only addition to that, I'm not  
3 convinced, because I'm not sure if that breaks up  
4 the massing a little bit too much. But, it's  
5 clearly something you can consider, but my point  
6 of view is a little different.

7 MS. WEINSTEIN: I believe Ms. Casarella's  
8 comment was to reduce the 5 story building to 4  
9 stories and in doing so reduce the height of the  
10 bay projections from 3 to 2. Is that correct?

11 MS. CASARELLA: Yes.

12 MS. BUELL: Okay. I think that the  
13 massing is appropriate, and I'd like to actually  
14 put that question as to whether or not the size  
15 of the building should be reduced from 5 stories  
16 to 4 stories to the rest of the Board, or if  
17 there's not opinion either way.

18 MS. SCOTT: I do feel that this is a  
19 commercial building that is at the transition  
20 point, and that it responds very much to in terms  
21 of its massing in height to the buildings that  
22 are next to it on 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and that it's not

1 over scaled.

2 MS. BACON: Also I believe that the  
3 height and massing is fine, and if you start  
4 loping off different floors then you change the  
5 economics, I know it's not what we're supposed to  
6 be dealing with, but this is a development and  
7 you can't just sort of, because you want, take  
8 off floors and have the whole thing continue to  
9 work.

10 MS. BUELL: Joseph?

11 MR. TAYLOR: I'm okay with massing and  
12 height, my comments were just fenestration and  
13 material amounts, so massing and height is okay.

14 MS. BUELL: Okay, my personal feeling is  
15 that I'm okay with the massing and the height,  
16 mainly because it steps down from a much larger  
17 building, and as a development moves into the  
18 residential portion, it is step down, and as you  
19 move across the Plaza there's another step down.

20 My fear is that it doesn't necessarily  
21 add anything to reduce the height of the building  
22 an entire floor.

1 MS. CASARELLA: What about the comment of  
2 making the bays consistent from the Plaza side to  
3 the 7<sup>th</sup> Street? Does anyone agree with that,  
4 thinks that should be considered?

5 MS. WEINSTEIN: Is that something I could  
6 comment on?

7 MS. BUELL: Please, please.

8 MS. WEINSTEIN: The reason that they're  
9 very different is that they have different  
10 context on both sides and years ago we did a  
11 little office building on Stanton Park where the  
12 façade facing the park doesn't have the rhythm of  
13 bay projections that the façade facing 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
14 does, because that's part of a row of historic  
15 structures that also had bay projections. But  
16 the façade facing the kind of public space, in  
17 that case Stanton Park, was designed more to the  
18 scale of the public space.

19 That is why we felt rather strongly that  
20 they should have different characters done  
21 intentionally.

22 We did look at breaking it up further and



1 perhaps into individual pieces, perhaps the staff  
2 remembers that?

3 MR. WILCOTT: The Staff does remember  
4 that. The whole notion of the chaos versus  
5 complexity was one that we talked about a lot,  
6 and whether or not the screen, with the  
7 projecting screen should be further broken down  
8 into more traditionally scaled projections, or  
9 should continue to read as one.

10 What was arrived at was sort of a hybrid,  
11 something that has these vertical reveals, which  
12 creates a sense of vertical pieces, and breaks  
13 down the big screen into smaller screens.

14 We had also pushed to have it pulled in  
15 from the corner, so that you have a sense of the  
16 base building returning down to the ground, on  
17 both sides.

18 So whether or not the reveals are  
19 sufficient, whether or not we have struck that  
20 right balance of chaos versus control is...

21 MS. CASARELLA: I think it's quite, the  
22 Plaza elevation is quite successful, I just think

1 it would make it a stronger building because it  
2 does have to stand up on its own as a building  
3 not just a series of elevations to bring it  
4 around the corner, bring the same treatment  
5 around the corner.

6 MR. WILCOTT: This may be a horrible idea  
7 but what if the language of the bays on 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
8 was more in the language of the screen as opposed  
9 to very ordered, and the architect may hate that  
10 idea.

11 MS. CASARELLA: It's something to  
12 consider.

13 MS. WEINSTEIN: The facades or the  
14 massing of the base.

15 MR. WILCOTT: No the fenestration  
16 treatment, as opposed to being very, very ordered  
17 and regularized on 7<sup>th</sup> Street, and more  
18 asymmetrically...

19 MS. WEINSTEIN: Actually on 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
20 the windows in the fronts of the bays are not  
21 ordered. They're symmetrical within each bay but  
22 then their also sliding, shifting back and forth

1 from bay to bay in terms of the placement.

2           It was our intent that all projections  
3 would be of the one language, you know, somewhat  
4 different from the base building; maybe we  
5 haven't achieved that yet.

6           MS. CASARELLA: They just look like  
7 they're coming from two different hands, right  
8 now to me.

9           MS. BUELL: Okay, okay. The North  
10 Residential Building, the ANC has requested a  
11 midblock setback. They have also raised concerns  
12 with the size of the service alleys, which we'll  
13 leave that out, because unless there's a  
14 preservation concern that's outside of our  
15 purview.

16           The ANC has also raised an issue with the  
17 rear view of the buildings and whether or not  
18 further study needs to be given to that view.

19           So we will start with Pam.

20           MS. SCOTT: I would disagree that this  
21 should be a midblock setback. I think that the  
22 framing of the masses now with the setbacks at

1 the ends, even of different lengths along the  
2 street, I think the 5 central bays that are in  
3 the middle should be raised above both ends, in  
4 terms of the response to normal Capitol Hill row  
5 house development, and in terms of the overall  
6 design itself.

7           The alley elevation is facing a narrow  
8 alley, and one of the members of the public  
9 commented that this was prison like in terms of  
10 its elevation and that it would be seen by many  
11 nearby residents. The facades throughout the  
12 alleys are not meant to be basic public facades;  
13 I don't find it a valid argument that this façade  
14 should be treated as a main façade.

15           MS. BUELL: Okay, thank you. Elinor?

16           MS. BACON: I'm disagreeing but I would  
17 urge that, that be relooked at, not for  
18 something, you know obviously which is going to  
19 say this is the front of the building, but  
20 something a little bit more saying we understand  
21 that this is another passage way that people are  
22 going to be looking at, and enjoying the

1 building. Thank you.

2 MS. BUELL: Joseph?

3 MR. TAYLOR: I agree with that. Alleys  
4 are subordinate to the main streets, but alleys  
5 have life, they are part of the community and  
6 pedestrian circulation. If you don't venture  
7 into the alley you certainly have a vista at the  
8 alley opening, where you have the option and the  
9 ability to view into the alley. This building  
10 backs up to residential homes and businesses, but  
11 the alley elevation needs some more study because  
12 of the setting, and because we aren't there yet.  
13 I wouldn't use the term that it's prison like,  
14 but it's unfinished.

15 MS. WEINSTEIN: Are we talking about the  
16 portion up on the screen here, the entire alley  
17 elevation, or the portion that is, the 4 story  
18 portion. I like the ends, the ends are fine.

19 Massing and scale appropriate and they  
20 step down to be respectful and be friendlier  
21 players from a contextual standpoint but you have  
22 the large block that's overpowering. I'm okay

1 with the massing of that, then I think the  
2 treatment of fenestration, and maybe to play with  
3 the planes a little bit and get into the details,  
4 it's large but makes it friendlier because you  
5 can make it smaller.

6 That's the focus there, and I'm agreeing  
7 with the Staff report that the entrance to the  
8 building needs some more study. Not just the  
9 point of entry, but the panel or the, the panel  
10 that the entry occurs in. Step back and then  
11 approach the entry and say well, if we aren't  
12 there yet, what would you do to make it at a  
13 point where we're there? Those are my comments,  
14 thank you.

15 MS. BUELL: Maria?

16 MS. CASARELLA: Okay. I'd like to start  
17 with the Plaza elevation, the front of the  
18 building. I agree with the comments regarding  
19 the entrance, certainly that can be developed  
20 more. When you showed the view of it looking  
21 east, I guess, what would be the - - from a  
22 pedestrian point of view what would be the

1 fullest view of it?

2           When I was looking at the drawing it had,  
3 just a kind of very homogenous character to it,  
4 as opposed to the other side where there's a lot  
5 of complexity, and seems very flat and almost  
6 institutional. I'm wondering if it's not so much  
7 in the way you articulated the windows, or the  
8 details but maybe it's just the bookends could be  
9 a slightly different color, just to kind of break  
10 up the mass of that. That view in particular  
11 where you have so much liveliness on one side and  
12 this is kind of serious.

13           I don't know perhaps the material change  
14 could be a way to address that, because the scale  
15 seems appropriate to me.

16           MS. WEINSTEIN: So using here we're using  
17 the same brick on the base of the 4 story, on the  
18 3 story part, and this is actually, it's very  
19 hard to render this not the brick, this area,  
20 this is a third terra cotta material.

21           MS. CASARELLA: So the terra cotta  
22 doesn't carry across to the 3 story piece then?

1           MS. WEINSTEIN: No. The 3 story are a  
2 slate on the top of the wall above brick, and the  
3 4 story is slate on the top floor, then terra  
4 cotta, and then brick.

5           MS. CASARELLA: Do you feel that would be  
6 a strong enough distinction?

7           MS. WEINSTEIN: I think as we look at the  
8 actual terra cotta of which there is a lot of  
9 possibility, this is something to think about to  
10 make sure that there's enough distinction.

11          MS. CASARELLA: All right, so something  
12 to consider. Can I say something about the  
13 alley? I agree with my colleagues comments about  
14 the alley elevation, while it is the back of the  
15 building, right now the view of the building is  
16 going to be those openings, the egress entries,  
17 and perhaps there's something a little bit more  
18 interesting that you could give the alley view.  
19 I'm done, your turn.

20          MR. SONDERMAN: Once again our renderings  
21 are always the bugaboo for people in terms of how  
22 we view what we're looking at. I know it's very



1 difficult for the renderings to give us an  
2 accurate representation, but I think you'd  
3 clarified that the materials that you're  
4 proposing will give the depth and diversity that  
5 we're looking for.

6 I support the Staff report on the C  
7 Street elevation. The alley elevation I support  
8 the rest of my colleagues. It is a little flat,  
9 and I acknowledge my previous 20 years on the  
10 Board of saying it's the alley, it's the alley.

11 But this is one of the few alleys that  
12 I'm familiar with where you get a tremendous  
13 amount of foot traffic from the public, and  
14 people actually drive down in; I've certainly  
15 scooted down it more than once.

16 It's more than just an alley on this  
17 block, perhaps enhancing just a little bit, but  
18 at the same time we have to stick with our  
19 Historic Preservation principles which is, it is  
20 an alley, and we have traditionally stepped way  
21 back on those types of fenestrations that we're  
22 looking for to make it on the front façade, but

1 it's maybe just a little sparse on this façade  
2 currently.

3 MS. WEINSTEIN: I think that's very  
4 clear. I'd just like to add that you're right,  
5 we all drive and walk down that alley now, but  
6 once C Street is reopened there might be less  
7 traffic there.

8 MS. BUELL: Okay. I just have a question  
9 in terms of the ANC's request for the midblock  
10 setback, what would that mean? Would that mean  
11 for the fourth floor?

12 MR. FISHBERG: Looking from 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
13 it's the visualization, looking more down the  
14 alley.

15 So the image on the right it's the first  
16 of the two story houses. It's hard to tell from  
17 here and we actually had to go walk down the  
18 alley, and sort of look at it, and measure it.

19 The fourth story component of the North  
20 Building starts just prior to the end of that 2  
21 story building, so its setback and you said 48  
22 feet, and the house doesn't, it goes beyond that

1 48 feet. So there's a point at which the, you  
2 know, the 4 stories is directly over the 2  
3 stories and it's separated by the 20 foot alley,  
4 give or take a few.

5           So whether it's at midblock setting back  
6 which was our official position, or whether  
7 there's a way, the conversation we had in our  
8 meeting, was to kind of, because a setback is  
9 actually further on the C Street side because of  
10 the way the internal mechanicals, the elevator  
11 shaft are situated, where there's a way to  
12 further setback the beginning of the 4 story  
13 component so that it allows more, you know we're  
14 giving deference to the sort of air and light of  
15 that in the building that's on the corner of 8<sup>th</sup>  
16 Street and the alley.

17           MS. BUELL: I see, so Amy is this the  
18 area in our drawing AO6 which is shaded?

19           MS. WEINSTEIN: Oh yes okay, actually  
20 while I have the plan up let me explain I think  
21 what Ivan was just saying is that the 4 story,  
22 here's the neighbor next door, this is their

1 house, this is their rear yard, this is the  
2 garage, and the 4 story part of the building  
3 starts right here, so it has a slight overlap  
4 with the back of the house.

5 Then looking at, I believe it's this  
6 drawing which is up here, that is the fourth  
7 floor there, that comes forward, that has the  
8 elevator and stair in it. That's the part that  
9 overlaps a little bit with into that house.

10 MS. BUELL: Okay, okay, so we're talking  
11 about a very small portion and the fact that  
12 there's mechanical equipment and the stairway  
13 there makes it a little bit difficult to move,  
14 but is there a way to move it. It sounds like as  
15 if it's not, it's only a couple of feet, we're  
16 not talking about...

17 MS. WEINSTEIN: We're required by the  
18 LDDA to have a certain number of units in this  
19 building, so we would lose a unit, or two or  
20 something to make that happen.

21 MS. BUELL: Okay, okay. Are there any  
22 comments or questions from the Board on this

1 particular issue, there's not a feeling either  
2 way that it is a major issue?

3 MS. CASARELLA: Again, I wonder, the farm  
4 of units you have on the roof is one per  
5 apartment?

6 MS. WEINSTEIN: We have one per unit and  
7 we are talking to our engineers about geothermal  
8 because it would be wonderful if it can work out  
9 that, which could be done.

10 MS. CASARELLA: I'm on a current campaign  
11 to get DDOT and public space to work with us on  
12 those issues, so maybe there's hope.

13 MS. BUELL: Okay, any other comments?  
14 Okay it sounds like the Board doesn't have a very  
15 strong preservation concern about that specific  
16 portion of the building, although if there is a  
17 way without loping off additional units to just  
18 set that particular portion of the building back  
19 it would be great to see it to address the ANC's  
20 concern, although the preservation concern is not  
21 as strong.

22 Okay, lets' see there were a number of

1 other comments made by the community members, and  
2 also by the ANC, particular as it relates to the  
3 entrance of the North Building, and I just want  
4 to echo that I am in agreement with the comments  
5 that were made by the community, and also the ANC  
6 that the entrances to this North Building need to  
7 be considered.

8 I believe that, that is all of the major  
9 issues. Are there any other major issues that  
10 the Board has not discussed in our deliberations,  
11 that either, the ANC, or community members would  
12 like us to discuss?

13 MR. FISHBERG: Not from the ANC. That  
14 reflects, I think between Brian's testimony about  
15 the other issues, which Steve went through, and  
16 then from what you've covered in this round, that  
17 covers it from ANC perspective.

18 MS. BUELL: Okay, okay. So what we'll  
19 come back with is a list of the open issues, but  
20 hopefully Amy that gives you a sense of where the  
21 Board is, both in terms of the current design  
22 plans and some of the open issues that still need

1 to be readdressed.

2           The list that's distributed will make  
3 clear that HPRB's decision is not, is limited to  
4 the preservation concerns, and is not a  
5 recommendation made to the BZA, and will also  
6 work with DMPED to host a meeting to talk about  
7 the use of public space, and include Tommy Wells  
8 Office, and DDOT, hopefully to address the larger  
9 issue of the number of tents, which is in part,  
10 outside, and I say in part outside of the  
11 Historic Preservation Purview.

12           So did I miss anything?

13           MR. FISHBERG: You got it.

14           MR. BUELL: So with that being said I  
15 would like to make a motion to approve the Staff  
16 report subject to the specific recommendations  
17 made by the Board.

18           I suspect we will see the project again  
19 once it has gone through the Zoning process, oh  
20 I'm sorry - - when is the next time we'll see the  
21 project?

22           MR. WILCOTT: I don't know the answer to

1 that. I think that the Applicants are working  
2 towards submitting something for the PUD filing  
3 for the Zoning Commission.

4 The project could return, and then of  
5 course they have to wait. So it could come back  
6 before the Board before the actual Zoning  
7 Commission hearing, or we could wait until after  
8 the Zoning Commission reviews it, and resolves  
9 some of these height and massing issues. The  
10 project may change dramatically.

11 MS. BUELL: I prefer to wait until after  
12 the Zoning process.

13 One of the concerns that the ANC  
14 specifically mentioned in their letter, that in  
15 some cases, they've only had seven days to review  
16 some of the changes.

17 So since it sounds like as if there's  
18 going to be a number of additional conversations,  
19 and additional community meetings, that the ANC  
20 has the ability to review all changes, provide  
21 sufficient time. We recognize they're not going  
22 to have months, but sufficient time for them to



1 review, get feedback from their constituents, and  
2 from the community groups, before it comes back  
3 to the Board.

4 Okay, is there, oh one other comment.

5 MS. CASARELLA: Yeah I think the next  
6 time we see the project we benefit from a 3  
7 dimensional model, the virtual walk through are  
8 helpful but...

9 MS. WEINSTEIN: A physical model.

10 MS. CASARELLA: Yes absolutely.

11 MS. WEINSTEIN: We've considered doing  
12 that, the community has requested through the ANC  
13 that the size of this project is such that the  
14 model gets to be so small in order to be  
15 transportable, that you can't ever really get  
16 down at eye level to see what it really looks  
17 like.

18 MR. FISHBERG: We invited them to put it  
19 in the North Hall of Eastern Market and have you  
20 all come down and look at it there.

21 MS. BUELL: It's an option.

22 MS. CASARELLA: Given all the changes,

1 and I think we do need a comprehensive view of  
2 all the massing in its entirety, and with some  
3 context, so...

4 MS. WEINSTEIN: How large a model are  
5 you...

6 MS. CASARELLA: I'll let you be the judge  
7 of that; I'll let you be the judge of that. I  
8 certainly had to deal with this myself on big  
9 planning projects but again I think we need some  
10 overall representation physically of all the  
11 massing together.

12 MS. BUELL: We would be willing to have a  
13 Board trip, if it is put in Eastern Market or  
14 some other space so that you don't have to worry  
15 about transporting it back and forth to the  
16 hearing room, if needed.

17 MS. CASARELLA: This would be at what, the  
18 next hearing, whenever that is?

19 MR. STERNLIEB: Which would be after the  
20 PUD is approved, it wouldn't come to you unless  
21 the PUD was approved, or modified in some way.

22 MS. CASARELLA: I understand what an

1   incredible amount of work it is, but I think it  
2   merits this.

3               MR. STERNLIEB: Once the PUD's approved we  
4   have to build exactly what the PUD says we have  
5   to build, so what we bring to you in a model form  
6   to look at it at that point is what we  
7   contractually have with the city to built, unless  
8   you change it, then we have to go back again to  
9   the Zoning Commission to get them to change it  
10  again.

11              At what point are we done, I guess is the  
12  question I'm asking.

13              MS. BUELL: That's actually a really good  
14  question because we don't want to have to review  
15  the plans 5 additional times, we want to review  
16  them just a few additional times but there are a  
17  number of major outstanding issues, so we can  
18  defer to Steve as to whether or not there comes a  
19  point where it's appropriate for the Historic  
20  Preservation Review Board to step back in and to  
21  provide additional guidance, particularly as it  
22  relates to the outstanding issues.

1           I don't want to have to bring you back  
2 before us an additional 4 times before you get  
3 the final approval.

4           So we can defer to Staff on what would be  
5 the appropriate number of follow up hearings or  
6 when those hearings would take place. We don't  
7 have to make an affirmative decision at this  
8 point.

9           MS. WEINSTEIN: I guess what concerns me  
10 about the 3D the physical model, is that in order  
11 to get it large enough for all these buildings to  
12 be seen with their detail it is enormous, and  
13 it's extremely expensive. To do it small enough  
14 that it would fit on half this table say, you're  
15 looking only at massing as a bird sees it flying  
16 above, so I'm not quite understanding the purpose  
17 down the road of bringing a model.

18          MR. TAYLOR: If I may, at the last  
19 meeting we had a very successful 3D computer  
20 modeling presentation on the Italian Embassy, and  
21 that was very helpful and much less expensive to  
22 show the views that we would need to see, and the

1 level of detail. I would offer that as a  
2 solution to see the exhibits in a 3D computer  
3 modeling format.

4 We have bird eye view, we had pull away  
5 shots, so that did it for me, and you would pass  
6 on the expense of the physical model. I would  
7 offer that as a way for us to see more with the  
8 same laptop.

9 MS. WEINSTEIN: We can include more aerial  
10 views than the last time we did that.

11 MS. BUELL: And pedestrian views because  
12 that's been one of the major concerns.

13 MR. TAYLOR: So I would say that's a more  
14 reasonable way to go.

15 MS. BUELL: Okay. Hopefully the ANC will  
16 see the presentation well before us with all the  
17 various views. Are you comfortable with that?

18 MR. FISHBERG: I think that the real  
19 question, and we understood, you know, some  
20 flexibility between virtual or real models, but I  
21 think the bigger question is the timing which  
22 goes to Joe's piece.

1           When do you see this, because, and maybe  
2   it's sort of prior to or as the start of the PUD  
3   process is beginning. I think, your kind of  
4   asking yourself when is the next hearing, and if  
5   it's not until it's the final sign off make sure  
6   everything was done as I understand the process  
7   from Steve, that's late in the day to impact this  
8   stuff, but it's also probably very hard for Amy  
9   to do what needs to be done in terms of design  
10   work to start the PUD process, to be able kind of  
11   be responsive almost to anything that the Board  
12   would do in the fall.

13           MS. BUELL: That's fine, we can see the  
14   plans again before the PUD process is complete,  
15   and we'll just defer to Staff as to when, and  
16   what stage that is.

17           Okay. Is there a motion to approve the  
18   Staff report subject to the revisions?

19           CHORUS: So ruled.

20           MS. BUELL: Is there a second?

21           MS. CASARELLA: Second.

22           MS. BUELL: All in favor please say aye.

1 CHORUS: Aye.

2 MS. BUELL: The Ayes have it. Thank you  
3 very much for taking the time to come down, and I  
4 apologize to everyone else who's had to wait, but  
5 it was important that we work through all of the  
6 issues. Thank you.

7 **3146 16th Street**

8 MR. DENNOE: In the interest of time while  
9 the Applicant's setting up I'm going to start  
10 giving my report.

11 The proposal is principally for an  
12 addition to the Meridian Hill Baptist Church, an  
13 addition that would wrap around the church and  
14 connect internally so that the church and  
15 addition would be of residential use.

16 That of course requires several changes  
17 to the church itself, including the insertion of  
18 floors, the...

19 MS. BUELL: This is the Mt. Pleasant  
20 case, are we not hearing the K Street matter  
21 today?

22 MR. DENNE: Not it's not on our agenda.

1 MS. BUELL: Joseph is going to recuse  
2 himself, Bob Sonderman has stepped away,  
3 hopefully it's okay with the Applicant that we  
4 don't have a quorum currently, but Bob Sonderman  
5 will return shortly.

6 Okay thank you, sorry about that.

7 MR. DENEEN: Several alterations to the  
8 church itself including new window openings,  
9 apertures in the roof, the changing out stain  
10 glass for clear windows, that would be of course  
11 more suitable to a residential use.

12 One of the first fundamental issues is  
13 the necessary demolition of the rear of the  
14 existing building, just simply to provide space  
15 for much of the addition.

16 It actually has something of its own  
17 history as an earlier church on this site it's  
18 about more than a decade older, but the limestone  
19 front portion was added about 11 years later, and  
20 concealed and in fact was responsible for sort of  
21 destroying the façade of the original church.

22 The original church, this rear wing was



1 also damaged over the years by the insertion of  
2 floors sort of back of house uses. Subsequently  
3 in 2008, by the leaping of the fire from the  
4 Deauville to this building which really destroyed  
5 the roof of the building, and some of the  
6 internal framing.

7           We have discussed the sort of general  
8 outlines of the proposal with the church and with  
9 the architects for more than two years, and the  
10 concerns being that how do you insert actually  
11 what's a taller addition around this building.

12           Of course while it's certainly preferable  
13 to have any rear addition not be visible at all  
14 behind the church you have to, and certainly sort  
15 of defer to the ridge of the roof. Ultimately it  
16 is a taller structure and so the question really  
17 came down to, how do you keep it from kind of  
18 looming over the church?

19           The side portion of the addition was  
20 never really an issue for us. I think from the  
21 beginning we could conceive of sort of a sliver  
22 building going into that space which is now used

1 for parking and circulation, and that it would  
2 sort of mediate between the height of the church  
3 itself and the apartment building to the south.

4           It was really the rear bar of the  
5 building which we thought a lot of attention  
6 needed to be paid. I think that the design has  
7 come along way.

8           It was very important, we thought, to  
9 have a building that really could be a background  
10 building in every sense. That it would sort of,  
11 merely appear to incidentally be there, and not  
12 sort of aggressively being a front to the  
13 building that would sort of be competing, with  
14 the building in front of it, so that it would not  
15 be sort of trying to come forward but would  
16 really be a recessive building.

17           Much in the way that you would see taller  
18 buildings, the back of taller buildings on the  
19 back of the block, behind sort of a subject  
20 building, or the side of a building, meeting  
21 another at a corner, and just having an unadorned  
22 side wall.

1           So, and we think that going to kind of a  
2 masonry punched opening that's pretty quiet, and  
3 yet pays some attention to relieving what could  
4 otherwise be a monotonous roof line is a real  
5 improvement over frankly earlier thoughts that  
6 you didn't see.

7           So we feel like we're pretty comfortable  
8 with the design of the rear bar.

9           Getting back to the demolition, the  
10 demolition is certainly a major issue, but we  
11 think that because of the loss of the integrity  
12 of the original design of the church, much of it,  
13 and the damage that is suffered since both from  
14 sort of intentional alterations and from the  
15 fire, that we think that its within the scope of  
16 the preservation law to permit it's demolition.

17           It's not the fact that that section needs  
18 to come down in that it can't be saved, and it  
19 couldn't be incorporated into a building or a new  
20 use. But it's really the new construction that  
21 necessitates it.

22           But, I think it's all right given the

1 overall, what's truly important about the  
2 character of the building today, what's character  
3 defining about this building?

4           So I do want to point out that  
5 nonetheless, the level of demolition and the type  
6 of demolition, and the fact of having the  
7 building wrapped in a larger addition. While it  
8 can certainly, the building is strong enough in  
9 design, and expression to stand up to these new  
10 additions. The totality of it is what we ought  
11 to look at, and the totality is somewhat of a  
12 degradation of integrity in terms of setting, in  
13 terms of design.

14           Ultimately we concluded that the most  
15 important issue, if you sort of accept or concede  
16 the idea of the demolition and the new additions  
17 it's really that we have to concentrate on,  
18 comeback to character defining portions of the  
19 church itself.

20           So the Staff report suggests that it's  
21 really the interventions into the core building  
22 that would be the most problematic issues.

1                   Visible intrusions into the roof that  
2   could be seen from 16<sup>th</sup> Street, punching through,  
3   making intrusions, or interventions into the side  
4   walls, which admittedly are going to be not  
5   prominently viewable by the public, because of  
6   the lack of space on either side of the main  
7   block of the Church, and the way the church is  
8   massed itself.

9                   That's not to say that we forget, or  
10   disregard alterations that are not prominently  
11   visible.

12                  So I think I will leave it at that for  
13   the moment.

14                  Maybe the best way to proceed, if the  
15   Board sort of agrees with the Staff, I'm not  
16   saying that's necessarily the case. What I'm  
17   suggesting is that we could sort of narrow down  
18   the scope of the discussion today.

19                  In other words let's focus on what the  
20   Board might see as problematic, and then we can  
21   kind of go to those images or issues.

22                  MS. BUELL: Okay. I'm fine with that if

1 the Applicant is fine with that, speaking  
2 specifically. In the interest of time we can  
3 start with the Boards and if we're able to get  
4 the computer presentation up and running we'll  
5 transition.

6 MR. WAGNER: Just very briefly before I  
7 turn this over to the Architect. Clark Wagner  
8 with the Bozzuto Group, Vice President, just  
9 wants to introduce myself. We're here with MJ  
10 Architects; Tom Johnson's going to give a brief  
11 overview.

12 We've been working on this for some time  
13 with the Church after the fire. This is a small  
14 condominium adaptive reuse as Tim's outline  
15 preserving the front part of the church. We're  
16 very excited about it; we've done Historic  
17 Preservation before. We're a big company, and  
18 we're comfortable that we can pull this off.

19 I think the Church has relocated  
20 temporarily outside the city, they still own the  
21 property. They're anxiously waiting, as we are  
22 to get through the process so that we can begin

1 the project.

2 I just wanted to mention that, and  
3 mention that we've been through several meetings  
4 with the ANC, we've responded to comments that  
5 they've given to us. We've met with the Mt.  
6 Pleasant Historic Society, and we've had a good  
7 go back and forth with the Staff. So with that  
8 I'll just turn it over to Tom.

9 MS. BUELL: Thank you.

10 MR. JOHNSON: I'm Tom Johnson with  
11 Martinez and Johnson Architecture. Should I  
12 just, is this the way you usually do it, just  
13 sort of stand and talk.

14 MS. BUELL: And we have a microphone.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Can everyone see? Well  
16 we're talking about the Meridian Hill Baptist  
17 Church formerly Mt. Pleasant Methodist Episcopal  
18 Church. I don't want to go into any more detail  
19 than you need to really know.

20 Essentially the church is in two pieces,  
21 there's the part from 1928, the Porter piece in  
22 the front, and then there's an original piece in

1 the back, they overlap.

2 The sanctuary is largely in this area,  
3 but it's somewhat disappeared. We are proposing  
4 removing the back piece and maintaining the three  
5 limestone walks in the front piece.

6 MR. DENNE: We're going to try and make  
7 it easy on you Tom - - if the Board has a  
8 particular area that we want to talk about. If  
9 you really want him to go through the whole  
10 thing, I mean that's certainly your prerogative.

11 MR. JOHNSON: No, if you think you  
12 understand it pretty well I was just going to  
13 give an overview of how the project worked but...

14 MS. SCOTT: I'd like to hear from the  
15 architect, just brief, but can we do that.

16 MR. JOHNSON: These are simply some views  
17 from around the site. Looking at it from across  
18 the street, this is really the key view. In our  
19 discussions with Tim when we went down to the  
20 site, when we went to the corner of Lamont and  
21 16<sup>th</sup> Street we felt like this was probably the  
22 most important view. You saw the two apartment



1 buildings to the north and to the south.

2           Some decisions have been made about the  
3 relative height of our addition based on that.  
4 There's also, since we're building behind the  
5 building this was the point of view of which we  
6 were determining whether the height behind the  
7 building would also be appropriate.

8           I also want to call your attention just  
9 to the way these other apartment buildings are  
10 broken down into bays, and the nature of all  
11 these freestanding apartment buildings along 16<sup>th</sup>  
12 Street, and part of the game, if you like, with  
13 our addition is to make it read as though it is a  
14 freestanding apartment building.

15           There's actually a third piece, all of  
16 which serve to breakdown the scale of the overall  
17 project, and the Church maintains its importance.

18           If we can very quickly look at this, this  
19 simply shows the separation on the north side,  
20 between the Church and its flanking building.

21           Here we see the 1916 piece of the Church  
22 that has largely been through an adaptive reuse

1 of its own. It's been converted to  
2 administrative space. We're looking at removing  
3 this piece, and we're looking at removing any  
4 sort of other pieces that have been built onto  
5 the building.

6 I promise we won't go through all the  
7 plans, but I did want to note that within this as  
8 the existing Church structure we see the intact  
9 quality of the limestone walls, and we would be  
10 retaining all of that. This is sort of the nature  
11 of the building around it, there's a gap on the  
12 south side, our building here goes up to the  
13 property line, and this is essentially the  
14 organization of the building all the way up.

15 Just going to jump ahead to the use of  
16 the roof, this was one of the more controversial  
17 aspects, and I think from the materials you have  
18 we've evolved a little bit.

19 Essentially when we're up into the roof  
20 we've been able to create some units. We aren't  
21 using the resource itself to in fill with the  
22 apartment building units themselves.

1           On this level we're sort of behind the  
2 parapet, and I'll show you that section in a  
3 second. We have the terraces at that point, and  
4 when we're a little bit higher up we've been able  
5 to put the terraces on the rear portion of the  
6 building. We have some studies here that I think  
7 will show the visual impact of that.

8           I was really hoping not to do this from  
9 boards today.

10           This is an interesting diagram in that it  
11 is the section, here's some sort of key views of  
12 the project. This is the section through the  
13 tower, we're seeing the elevation, the south  
14 elevation of the building, and we're about 15  
15 feet off of the property line here in the back.  
16 We've moved it back at the request of the ANC.

17           What you're seeing in yellow is the  
18 profile of the existing addition that we're  
19 looking at removing. When we look at it the  
20 other way, when we're cutting through the Church  
21 looking west you start to see the nature of the  
22 addition as a backdrop to the Church itself.

1           Why don't we just skip right ahead to  
2 some of these views of the Church, and what you  
3 see from what point.

4           We've had a couple of different ideas  
5 that we wanted to get your opinion about, the  
6 rear portion. It's a brick punched opening type  
7 of a building. They're not really trying to  
8 create the back of a building, but because of the  
9 nature of the block it's pretty much where a rear  
10 elevation would be for a building on Mt. Pleasant  
11 Street. It's organized, it's basically a  
12 corridor but we're trying to let light in, and  
13 we're trying to create, and preserve the scale of  
14 the neighborhood.

15           This is sort of the key piece of the  
16 addition; it's a leg that's brought out to be in  
17 line with the face of the building. It's very  
18 glassy, very open on the front.

19           The sides are a metallic material, system  
20 type material, and we'll show you some options  
21 that we're looking at for that.

22           But, we feel like this has something to

1 do with the proportions of other apartment  
2 buildings along 16<sup>th</sup> Street, and there's a gap or  
3 niche as we go to the back, with the idea that we  
4 are further breaking down the scale by having  
5 this read almost as though it's its own building.

6           Simply the view from across the street,  
7 we're maintaining the same treatment on the south  
8 side on the property line. Then as we get even  
9 further down, that view essentially disappears.

10           I think we sort of, in our abbreviated  
11 way, we sort of went through all of it.

12           MS. BUELL: Can you respond to the  
13 comments that Tim raised in his Staff report?

14           MR. JOHNSON: Yes. This is one of the  
15 more troubling or more perplexing issues for us;  
16 it's how to deal with the historic façade. It's  
17 a very narrow aperture in terms of being able to  
18 see this but it is there.

19           We're looking at trying to change the  
20 fenestration patterns as little as we can. This  
21 is the existing pattern, they're not original  
22 stain glass windows, but they are stain glass

1 windows, we're looking at removing them, we're  
2 looking at salvaging them, returning them to the  
3 Church itself.

4           We're sort of looking at this increment  
5 of the window, this is basically where the choir  
6 loft is, and we're looking at, we're essentially  
7 inserting three floors in there, and we're trying  
8 to do it in a treatment where they read as  
9 windows as opposed to more of a clear story type  
10 of a treatment.

11           This was one of Tim's issues and I think  
12 I'm not sure we're quite there yet but we're  
13 trying to work in that direction.

14           MS. BUELL: How visible is this from the  
15 street, or can you not see it?

16           MR. JOHNSON: It's virtually invisible  
17 from the street. You're looking down a fairly  
18 narrow - - on the north side there's like a 4  
19 foot gap between it and the building.

20           MS. BUELL: Oh so that's the view, okay.

21           MR. JOHNSON: Then on the south side it's  
22 maybe a little more noticeable, but we're not

1 really trying to hide it, we're just trying to  
2 find a way to make it work.

3           The stain glass windows don't work, so  
4 we've really tried to kind of create a unit with  
5 this window; they're actually windows as opposed  
6 to one larger fenestration pattern.

7           This would be the impact on the south  
8 side of cutting into the roof; we're essentially  
9 rebuilding the roof and returning the slate to  
10 it.

11           I think one of Tim's comments which is  
12 sort of how far we're going from a preservation  
13 point of view and I think that's something that  
14 we can continue to discuss but I think from a  
15 preservation point of view we're looking at  
16 restoring the limestone façade.

17           We're retaining the monumental stairs as  
18 the main way to get into the building. There are  
19 more circumstantial ways for physically  
20 challenged people and that sort of thing, but  
21 essentially the ordering device of the original  
22 building would be maintained.

1           We're looking at putting the roof back on  
2 in-kind and in its same profile. Then we're  
3 looking at trying to respect it with a little bit  
4 of space all the way around it.

5           MS. BUELL: What about mechanical  
6 equipment where will that be placed?

7           MR. JOHNSON: Mechanical equipment, I  
8 could almost repeat Amy's comments on this one.

9           We're still looking at developing  
10 systems, and in our experience we're trying to  
11 develop a way to use package units that would be  
12 smaller. We're bringing the parapet, one reason  
13 we're bringing the parapet up as high as we are  
14 is to be able to disguise these things, they seem  
15 like they'd be less than 4 feet in height.

16           The same thing with the elevator  
17 penthouse, we're not bringing the elevator  
18 penthouse house to the roof, or the elevator to  
19 the roof, but you'll have just the override  
20 coming up.

21           I think our studies here show that it  
22 would be about here, and you would see just a



1 little tiny bit of it. These are actually  
2 constructed views from the points of view that we  
3 had chosen, and we think it will largely  
4 disappear.

5 The stairway that comes up we're trying  
6 to do within a well, so that the stair house,  
7 penthouse doesn't come up either.

8 I don't know that we're going to be able  
9 to do all of these things but that's the  
10 direction that we're pursuing right now, assuming  
11 that we can make these things happen with our  
12 engineering input.

13 The only other issue I can think of is  
14 that we were looking at manipulating the ground  
15 plane around the church, on both the north, and  
16 south side, and we're not going to do that.  
17 We're going to maintain the existing grade as it  
18 is. I think that's about it.

19 I mean I think, it always comes down to  
20 the height, that's sort of the biggest issue.

21 We've looked at post-tensioning the  
22 slabs; we looked at sort of minimal floor to

1 floors. We looked at trying to do everything we  
2 can. Sort of what you see there is pretty much  
3 where we're at.

4 We don't have the parapet, you see some  
5 things on the roof, if you do have the parapet  
6 they go away but the building seems higher, and  
7 that seems to be the trade off at the moment.

8 I think that's I apologize for the  
9 disjointedness of it, but I think those are  
10 really the issues. It's a complex little project  
11 but the issues are pretty self explanatory.

12 MS. BUELL: Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, I'm Faye  
14 Armstrong from Historic Mt. Pleasant, we have met  
15 with Tom and Clark, and talked a little bit with  
16 the ANC. Obviously the damage, I mean this  
17 building now is just standing as blight on the  
18 neighborhood, and we're very, very anxious, and  
19 delighted that someone is tackling the project,  
20 it's a difficult project.

21 We support the Staff report and I'm glad  
22 to hear that Tom and Tim are trying to look at

1 the fenestration and everything, it is - - the  
2 concerns that Tim very properly raises are  
3 moderated by the limited visibility particularly  
4 on the north, also on the south, but obviously to  
5 the extent that the limestone, that the existing  
6 apertures, can be maintained as much as possible,  
7 is very much to be desired.

8           Tim mentioned that the windows, the  
9 colored windows are not, those were added by the  
10 Baptist, and the Methodist had clear windows when  
11 they did extend the front of the Church. We  
12 don't have a picture of it, at that time, but so  
13 that we're completely comfortable with replacing  
14 the stain glass windows with something that goes  
15 back to clear glass.

16           MR. DENNE: Let me just reiterate. I  
17 think the Staff recommendation doesn't mention  
18 anything about the stain glass windows, or the  
19 height. I don't think it's all about the height.  
20 Once you break a height which is sort of lower  
21 than, or apparently lower than, as you see it in  
22 perspective, the ridge of the Church, or wanted

1 to be more restrictive, one might say the sort of  
2 cornice level of the Church.

3           Then the exact height of the parapet a  
4 foot or two doesn't matter so much. So I  
5 disagree that it's all about the height, but I  
6 think that one of the points brought up in the  
7 Staff recommendation relates directly to the idea  
8 of not having visible mechanical penthouses, or  
9 stair penthouses come up beyond that parapet  
10 height.

11           Being behind this building, you know you  
12 read the building, and you follow its pyramidal  
13 roof up, and then you're going to see the  
14 background building and follow it up. If you're  
15 view terminates at the mechanical behind that,  
16 that's going to be an unfortunate setting for the  
17 building.

18           So that was one point, the other point is  
19 the intrusions into the building itself, again  
20 this has to be looked at holistically.

21           When you say well, you know, you're not  
22 going to be able to see the sides of the building

1 that much, unless, of course, you're standing  
2 there. I mean, the preservation law doesn't  
3 limit views, it's not like the CFA jurisdiction  
4 or Alexandria's law which says all that matters  
5 is what you see from public space.

6 But, furthermore, you have to acknowledge  
7 that the reason the south elevation is going to  
8 be difficult to view is because we're going to be  
9 putting a big building there. So I think you  
10 have to consider the holistic change, I hate to  
11 use a loaded word like this but it is a  
12 degradation of the integrity of the property,  
13 it's setting, and it's design.

14 We've sort of conceded the additions, and  
15 their height, and their location, and sort of  
16 their character, and we've conceded several  
17 things about this but I think the most important  
18 - - oh the demolition of course, which is a major  
19 thing and all of it, adds up.

20 I think what you have to come back to  
21 since we're left with three exterior walls and  
22 presumably the basement floor, and the main floor

1 of the building, what does that piece, what is  
2 left look like? How natural does it look, how  
3 much does it look like it did in its historic  
4 period of significance?

5           So the issues are really ones of physical  
6 intrusion into fabric that is to say the  
7 limestone panels between the windows and how that  
8 looks, so it's both fabric and appearance, and  
9 ultimately how does the roof look with things  
10 coming through it our out of it. We don't have  
11 an objection to penetrations in the roof but we  
12 think as in most cases in the Board's review that  
13 such things should be out of sight, so that if it  
14 can be done, so it is indeed screened by the  
15 parapet, by being low, or being far back or being  
16 on the rear, that that's acceptable, and in fact  
17 we encourage it. But we'd have to be convinced  
18 of that by not only designs but probably mock ups  
19 or stick tests.

20           MS. BUELL: Okay, okay. We'll open it up  
21 for Board comment. We'll start with Pam.

22           MS. SCOTT: I think that Tim's very able

1 discussion of this is right on, and I totally  
2 agree with it.

3 MS. BUELL: Okay.

4 MS. BACON: I concur also, and also I  
5 applaud the developer for taking on such a  
6 challenging project because, I mean we will have  
7 something left instead of a huge gap or some  
8 other building, and so I think that's very  
9 exciting that you're doing it.

10 MS. BUELL: Okay. Maria?

11 MS. CASARELLA: Are we commenting about  
12 everything?

13 MS. BUELL: Yes.

14 MS. CASARELLA: Okay, all right. Tim I  
15 think you make a pretty compelling case about  
16 what's left of the building, since we are  
17 removing a substantial amount of it, perhaps  
18 there's more of a compromise with the removal of  
19 the limestone spandrel panels and the roof for  
20 the terraces. It looks like the terraces are  
21 serving two units; you're getting a single unit  
22 on the upper portion, or three units.

1           MR. JOHNSON: What we now have available  
2 is a walk through from the street where you might  
3 be able to understand what the roof looks like  
4 from eye level.

5           MR. JOHNSON: This is walking along 16<sup>th</sup>  
6 Street, walking north from the opposite side of  
7 the street.

8           MS. CASARELLA: So the terraces are not  
9 visible?

10          MR.: From this side it would be just a  
11 fraction of a second when a little white piece  
12 will come into view. At this distance I can't  
13 even see it. You'll be able to see it once you  
14 get a little more relief from the north looking  
15 towards the south.

16          MR. JOHNSON: The terrace is essentially  
17 behind the limestone parapet on the north and  
18 south side.

19          MR. ??: I think versus the version which  
20 you might have, we had revised it a little bit in  
21 the past week, and bringing it down so it only  
22 serves that fifth floor of the units inside of



1 the Church it's really visible from only a very  
2 small area on the street.

3 In a moment it will come into view as you  
4 get farther away up here, you'll just be able to  
5 see it over the parapet line of the church.

6 MS. CASARELLA: I guess I have less of a  
7 problem if it's not visible.

8 MR. DENNE: As do I, that was sort of my  
9 recommendation.

10 MS. CASARELLA: The addition however, the  
11 back wall, I guess, I disagree with the premise  
12 that it should be designed like the back of a  
13 building since it's so highly visible from 16<sup>th</sup>  
14 Street, and I'm not really understanding, with  
15 both options, why that's the best strategy given  
16 that you're designing a, there's no reason that  
17 the portion of the building that is on 16<sup>th</sup> Street  
18 shouldn't match the other part of the L.

19 I don't know then the portions of the  
20 windows are kind of severe. It's really, I guess  
21 Tim you made comments, it is looming over the  
22 building, and I would say make it consistent, and

1 you know, from both pieces, both legs of the L.

2 MR. DENNE: I'm sure the Applicant would  
3 be happy to hear whatever recommendations you  
4 have about, sort of the expression of any  
5 elevation. But, we definitely push that the side  
6 bar, and the rear bar would look different so  
7 that you'd lessen the sense that the building was  
8 being enveloped, when in fact it is being  
9 enveloped, but that this is another building  
10 happening back behind, and a sliver building in  
11 the notch, to the extent that you carry that  
12 expression around, it's sort of, you know...

13 MS. CASARELLA: Well maybe the strategy  
14 should be, instead of a masonry wall, it should  
15 be glass, and then it's lighter, because purely  
16 in contrast I'm sure you've...

17 MR. DENNE: That's where we started out.

18 MS. CASARELLA: I'll just say I think  
19 it's not compatible with the existing structure.  
20 I think having this heavy wall behind what is a  
21 heavy masonry pavilion doesn't complement it, and  
22 that's my preservation point of view on it.

1 MS. BUELL: Do you have pictures of what  
2 it looked like when you had the all glass  
3 addition behind the Church?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Not with us no, it might  
5 have been in an earlier package we sent you, but  
6 no I don't think so.

7 MR. DENNE: In fact while, glass or at  
8 least our idea of glass is that it feels lighter,  
9 it's reflective, it's very much frontal, even  
10 being plainer and quiet it's more aggressive  
11 because it's trying to be the front and this is  
12 in fact the back, so we thought it's more of a  
13 comfortable relationship to have a more masonry  
14 punched opening expression so that it sort of  
15 reads as something that's merely behind.

16 It's not designed, as Tom suggested,  
17 precisely like the rear of an apartment building,  
18 because it's a little more playful than that.

19 MS. CASARELLA: I don't see playful, we  
20 were talking about penitentiaries, the  
21 proportions of the windows - - anyway I think  
22 I've made my point.

1           MR. JOHNSON: It's actually interesting  
2   that you point that out because I did want to  
3   note that the other windows in the building, even  
4   though we've got a lot of glass in the front  
5   piece, and the panelization treatment on the  
6   side, they are consciously panelized in a way  
7   that kind of recalls the residential proportions  
8   of other buildings on 16<sup>th</sup> Street. It was that one  
9   piece in the back that we were going a little bit  
10  more abstract with it. That's something we can  
11  easily work with Tim on.

12           MR. DENNE: The other consideration was  
13  really that a glass box is not 16<sup>th</sup> Street, nor is  
14  it Mt. Pleasant; it's just sort of fundamental  
15  compatibility issues.

16           MS. BUELL: So maybe there's a way to  
17  find some sort of compromise without going back  
18  to the all glass treatment, and not making it  
19  look like the front of a building either, but  
20  having something that's clearly subordinate to  
21  the Church, but still as not understated as this.

22           MS. CASARELLA: It's a corridor, it's a

1 breezeway, I mean it could be expressed that way,  
2 and I don't think it will be - - it's just very  
3 severe at this point.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Actually on this board  
5 there is another version of it on the right, and  
6 I don't think any of us like that very much  
7 either.

8 I did want to point out that we brought  
9 the front piece up an additional level. The  
10 residential stops one level up from that, but  
11 it's more of an envelope, or wrapper, around a  
12 roof guard type, and so you don't see  
13 miscellaneous sorts of uncontrollable pieces from  
14 the street. If we do end up having some pieces  
15 of mechanical equipment that we just can't deal  
16 with, they can also be sort of within the box,  
17 and don't stick up.

18 Absolutely we can continue to work with  
19 Tim; we've got plenty of ideas on this one.

20 MS. BUELL: Bob?

21 MR. SONDERMAN: As long as plenty ideas  
22 remain on the table I'm willing to support the

1 Staff report.

2           Once again it's the rendering that is the  
3 bugaboo for every architect that comes in here.  
4 The rendering of the back, the building behind  
5 the Church just goes uhh!

6           If it's going to be that creamy, yellowy  
7 look it's not going to blend.

8           So, it's all in the materials, all in the  
9 way you render, but let's keep Tim's options  
10 open.

11           MS. BUELL: Okay, I'd echo Tim's points  
12 and Maria's comments about the façade of the rear  
13 addition behind the Church.

14           I am comfortable, particularly given Mt.  
15 Pleasant's comments on the windows and the fact  
16 that they are not visible from public space.  
17 There's limited visibility and changing them from  
18 the stain glass to the all glass...

19           Also I just want to add a comment about  
20 the demolition. Given the loss of integrity our  
21 standard is whether or not the demolition is  
22 substantial, and also compatible with the terms

1 of the Preservation Act, and for both, the fact  
2 that there has been substantial damage, and the  
3 loss of integrity, I'm comfortable with the  
4 amount of demolition to the Church.

5 So, hopefully that gives you some  
6 guidance, and issues to work with, not too much.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely, thank you very  
8 much.

9 MS. BUELL: All right perfect. Is there  
10 a motion to approve the Staff report?

11 MS. CASARELLA: So moved.

12 MS. BUELL: Is there a second?

13 MR. SONDERMAN: Second.

14 MS. BUELL: Okay. All in favor say aye.

15 CHORUS: Aye.

16 MS. BUELL: Great the ayes have it.  
17 Thank you very much and my apologies for the  
18 delay today.

19 MS. BUELL: We are going to; we're losing  
20 Board Members so we're going to take a 5 minute  
21 break just to make sure we have enough Board  
22 Members to hold the hearing, because we are

1 running over, so we're just going to take a few  
2 minutes to regroup.

3 **1427-29 Rhode Island Avenue**

4 MR. WILCOTT: So this is a project of new  
5 construction in the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Historic District,  
6 located on Rhode Island Avenue.

7 This was the site of two small scale  
8 townhouses, 19<sup>th</sup> Century townhouses, that the  
9 Board approved demolition of back in 2006.

10 At the time, and I apologize for this,  
11 but I had forgotten that the Board actually  
12 attached two conditions to the approval of that  
13 demolition.

14 The townhouses in question were in  
15 deteriorated condition, however the Board made  
16 two recommendations, one was that the stone of  
17 one of the two houses, it had a very nice sort of  
18 Romanesque façade, and that the stone of that  
19 façade be looked at as to whether or not, it  
20 could be incorporated into any new construction  
21 on the site.

22 The second condition was that archaeology



1 be investigated on this site. Again, my  
2 apologies, I had forgotten that the Board had put  
3 those conditions on until after the Staff report  
4 was released.

5           So we are recommending approval of the  
6 project, it calls for a new, what is it 8 or 9  
7 stories? Eight story apartment building, very  
8 closely related in façade design to the two  
9 flanking buildings on either side of it, which  
10 were designed by the same architect and a very  
11 similar design, the Tripartite Organization.

12           This building will have two Oriole Bays  
13 on it to give it a little bit of surface relief.

14           So, the Staff is recommending approval of  
15 the concept. Early in the conversation about the  
16 replacement of the townhouses on this site back  
17 in 2006, I had talked to the developer about the  
18 notion of reusing the stone, and it was pretty  
19 clear that it was going to be very difficult to  
20 incorporate a townhouse façade into a new  
21 multistory apartment building, they're just two  
22 very fundamentally different pieces.

1           There wasn't enough stone, for instance  
2 to use it as a base for the building, so frankly  
3 we sort of dismissed that idea even though it was  
4 the Staff that had recommended that idea.

5           We investigated it, we looked at it, but  
6 we determined that it really wasn't feasible.

7           I think what we could continue to do, is  
8 look at whether or not that stone could be  
9 incorporated into some sort of a garden element,  
10 or a retaining wall of some sort in the public  
11 space, at the base of the building, or something  
12 like that.

13           I don't think it's, frankly, a huge  
14 preservation issue because the buildings are  
15 gone, and I think trying to recreate them is just  
16 not really feasible or practical.

17           In terms of the archaeology, Ruth  
18 Trocolli did a little bit of initial research on  
19 this site, and found that there was a two story  
20 alley dwelling at the rear of one of the  
21 properties, which she thinks does have some  
22 possibility to gain some additional information

1 that we don't have in the record about this  
2 neighborhood, and about alley dwellings in the  
3 19<sup>th</sup> Century.

4 So, we're recommending that a phase I  
5 archeological study be done, really with a focus  
6 on trying to find information related to that  
7 alley dwelling. Again, that's the sort of more  
8 unusual resource, for us to investigate, and  
9 document archeologically.

10 So, I have not shared that with the  
11 Applicant, so this is coming as new information  
12 to them. Ruth is certainly prepared to help  
13 them, sort of walk them through that process and  
14 understand better what it means.

15 So we will continue to coordinate with  
16 the developer on that. So that's our late  
17 breaking new information for you, sorry about  
18 that.

19 MS. BUELL: Great. Thank you.

20 MR. BUSE: Hi, my name is Gordon Buse;  
21 I'm the Chief Operating Officer of Abdo  
22 Development. I'd like to apologize Jim Abdo did

1 want to be present for this with the switch in  
2 date from last week to this week, he was away and  
3 did plan on flying back but he did become ill  
4 which did not allow him to come back on the  
5 plane.

6           However, I'm intimately familiar with  
7 what we've designed, and with the neighborhood  
8 and feel I can run you through it. I know time  
9 is tight and so I have very brief presentation,  
10 and can answer any questions.

11           MS. BUELL: Great thank you.

12           MR. BUSE: I just wanted to quickly give  
13 you an overview of what the neighborhood looks  
14 like, you're probably familiar but this is the  
15 corner of 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Rhode Island here, these  
16 are the Abdo Offices here, as you go down the  
17 site there is apartment buildings running here.  
18 This is the Willison which is a condominium  
19 building that Abdo development built and sold  
20 back in the 2002, timeframe.

21           This is the site here, it's 1427 and 29  
22 Rhode Island Avenue, as you're probably aware

1 from the report it is a very narrow site, it's  
2 only about 20 feet, however it is fairly deep.

3           The next building is Zenith, and that's a  
4 condominium building, again you'll see that these  
5 two facades are very similar in nature. Then as  
6 you move down there are larger scale apartments.

7           As you come across the street here on the  
8 other side of Rhode Island Avenue you have a 7-11  
9 along the corner, there are some row homes here,  
10 and then two hotels, you have the Helix and the  
11 City Hotel, and then again apartment buildings  
12 down to the corner of 15<sup>th</sup>.

13           I just wanted to give you some further  
14 street shots, again coming from the corner of 14<sup>th</sup>  
15 Street with Rhode Island running this way you  
16 have those townhouses I talked about, there's a  
17 row home here behind the tree. This is the Helix  
18 hotel which continues down to here with the City  
19 Hotel here, a freestanding single row home, and  
20 then more apartments that continue down to the  
21 end and you can see the apartments down here to  
22 the end of the corner of 15<sup>th</sup> and Rhode Island.

1           Across the other side of the street again  
2   starting down at the 14<sup>th</sup> and Rhode Island side,  
3   this is a small freestanding office building  
4   that's just before the apartments that run  
5   adjacent to them the Wilson, which is 1425 Rhode  
6   Island Avenue.

7           MS. BUELL: Most of our Board Members we  
8   visit the site so we're very familiar with this.

9           MR. BUSE: All right well I'll stop going  
10   through the building by building.

11           So this is the façade that we're  
12   proposing and have been in discussions with Steve  
13   about, so you can see you have the Willison on  
14   this side, Zenith on this side, and the proposed  
15   structure here.

16           It is three separate pieces; this is  
17   going to be the pressed concrete with the brick  
18   with the two projections, and then the cornice  
19   along the top, eight stories.

20           Then we do have some retaining walls, we  
21   initially had the handicapped elevation working  
22   here but we worked through that with Steve to try

1 and make that presentation from the street a  
2 little bit better.

3 MS. CASARELLA: I'm sorry could you  
4 explain again what those walls are, they're  
5 labeled as planters?

6 MR. BUSE: I'm sorry here?

7 MS. CASARELLA: Yeah the two retaining  
8 walls.

9 MR. BUSE: I believe these are retaining  
10 walls that we're going to do some plantings on.

11 This is originally where we had the  
12 stairs.

13 MR. WILCOTT: One of the challenges of  
14 this project is that they are trying to work off  
15 of a shared alley, or shared drive, not an alley,  
16 but off of the rear alley with, is it the  
17 Willison?

18 MR. BUSE: It is the Willison, if you  
19 look here here's the Willison they have a one  
20 story below grade parking, and there's a drive  
21 aisle here. This is an alley here, which you're  
22 familiar with the area but Whole Foods just backs

1 up to it; it's a very large alley.

2           So we have an agreement that was done  
3 when the Willison was built that this would be a  
4 shared drive aisle, so this is a double aisle.  
5 So they come in and turn here, we're planning a  
6 one level below grade parking here with; it's got  
7 five tandem spaces underneath.

8           MR. WILCOTT: So what that's doing is it's  
9 actually pumping the first floor up a little bit  
10 because of the grade issues of getting into a  
11 below grade garage. That's why the windows on  
12 the first floor are higher than the lobby doors.  
13 The lobby doors had been raised up which  
14 resulted in a very large ramp, and public space,  
15 and a lot of paving.

16           It may be that it actually makes sense to  
17 sort of split the difference a little bit, and  
18 push the door back up a little bit, and have a  
19 smaller ramp so that it doesn't feel like you're  
20 coming in kind of at a half level.

21           I think the base of the building that  
22 first floor, the planters, and the door are a



1 little awkward and probably need some additional  
2 work.

3 MS. BUELL: Agreed.

4 MS. CASARELLA: So those aren't planters?

5 MR. WILCOTT: No those were the location  
6 of where the ramps had been, and they have been  
7 sort of converted to planters. I think they're  
8 scale, I think they're a way to sort of ground  
9 the building. Maybe that's not the most  
10 effective way to do it.

11 MR. BUSE: This is a typical floor plan,  
12 this is the first floor plan, so you will enter  
13 through that door into the lobby, and this stack  
14 of units will be one bedroom with the remaining  
15 units being studios.

16 MS. BUELL: And we don't get into uses,  
17 so we can go over the floor plans.

18 MR. BUSE: Okay that's really where we  
19 were finished off.

20 MS. BUELL: Oh great, so maybe that  
21 previous picture if you can leave us with that,  
22 and we can open it up for Board comment, on the

1 front elevation.

2 MR. WILCOTT: There's also not been  
3 development yet of a rear elevation, so that's  
4 something that needs to be developed as well.  
5 This is a relatively quick run to try and get  
6 some feedback. This does require some Zoning  
7 relief, and I think there's a scheduled BZA  
8 hearing for mid September before your next HPRB  
9 meeting. So I think the Applicants were looking  
10 to get some generally direction before that, but  
11 there are obviously some things that still need  
12 to be worked out.

13 MS. BUELL: Okay, okay. Well we will  
14 start with Maria.

15 MS. CASARELLA: Okay. You know generally  
16 in concept the façade, is fine, it seems  
17 appropriate, it just needs a lot of detail, and I  
18 guess we'll get to that later.

19 I would recommend the entry, you consider  
20 raising up the glass at the entry, just so maybe  
21 the lines with the heads at the adjacent windows  
22 are coming up, with some way of negotiating the

1 ground level, and then the level once you get  
2 into the lobby. So, that's my only comment.

3 MS. BUELL: Okay. Joseph?

4 MR. TAYLOR: I'm in agreement with the  
5 Staff report and Maria holistically you're on the  
6 right track in terms of the concept.

7 I appreciate Steve's back-story on why  
8 the entry doors are right at grade, and I agree  
9 with you to split the difference and you have  
10 some success with the driveway and the alley.

11 Raise the entry doors a little bit and  
12 then work out a small amount of ramp to provide  
13 access, then the entry in the base is working a  
14 little better in concept with that.

15 Give some more attention to the windows  
16 of the first two levels and then I think we're  
17 there. Those are my comments, thank you.

18 MS. BACON: I concur with the Staff  
19 report.

20 MS. SCOTT: I think Maria stated it very  
21 well.

22 MS. BUELL: I concur with the Staff

1 report. I have a, I'm learning that I have this  
2 new issue with projecting bays, and use of  
3 different materials in the bays, so my suggestion  
4 is that you consider using similar materials to  
5 what's already in the building, whether it's  
6 brick or something else. Sometimes they end up  
7 looking like more of a suburban design when the  
8 buildings are actually completed.

9           Because you have two fairly formal  
10 apartment buildings on either side of this  
11 building, I think something that's more formal in  
12 its treatment would be appropriate and that may  
13 just be a material change.

14           Okay. With that being said are there any  
15 other comments?

16           Well thank you for coming down, again we  
17 apologize for running late, but it sounds like  
18 you're well on your way and I guess we will  
19 review the drawings again, as they're further  
20 developed.

21           MR. BUSE: So we'll send it back to you  
22 guys for further review.

1 MS. BUELL: Yes please. Our comments  
2 will likely be limited to any rear façade or  
3 additional details. It won't be about the size,  
4 scale...

5 MR. BUSE: And would that be the  
6 appropriate time to bring back information on the  
7 archeological report as well?

8 MS. BUELL: That would be wonderful, yes,  
9 thank you.

10 Okay. So is there any motion to approve  
11 the Staff report?

12 So moved.

13 MS. BUELL: Is there a second?

14 Second.

15 MS. BUELL: All in favor say aye.

16 CHORUS: Aye.

17 MS. BUELL: All right the ayes have it.  
18 Thank you very much.

19 MR. BUSE: One question, when it comes  
20 back in front of you is that before, or after the  
21 BZA case?

22 MR. SONDERMAN: After, it will have to be

1 after.

2 MS. BUELL: That concludes our August 4,  
3 2011, HPRB overflow hearing. Thank you everybody  
4 for bearing with us.

5 (Whereupon, at approximately 1:27 p.m., the  
6 meeting was concluded).

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22